

PROJECTIVELY INVARIANT STAR PRODUCTS

DANIEL J. F. FOX

ABSTRACT. It is shown that a (curved) projective structure on a smooth manifold determines on the Poisson algebra of smooth functions on the cotangent bundle, fiberwise-polynomial of bounded degree, a one-parameter family of graded star products. For a particular value of the parameter (corresponding to half-densities) the star product is symmetric, and specializes in the projectively flat case to the one constructed previously by C. Duval, P. Lecomte and V. Ovsienko. These star products are built from a projectively invariant quantization map associating to a symmetric polyvector a formally self-adjoint operator on densities. A limiting form of this family of star products yields a commutative deformation of the symmetric tensor algebra of the manifold which is closely related to the limiting commutative multiplication of modular forms defined by P. Cohen, Y. Manin, and D. Zagier. A basic ingredient of the proof is the construction of projectively invariant multilinear differential operators on bundles of weighted symmetric k -vectors. The construction works except for a discrete set of excluded weights and generalizes the Rankin-Cohen brackets of modular forms.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this paper is to associate to (curved) projective structures on a smooth manifold, M , certain algebraic structures. Precisely, to each projective structure is associated a representation of symmetric polyvectors as self-adjoint operators on the space of half-densities on M , and from this is built a canonical deformation of the Poisson algebra structure on the algebra, $\text{Pol}^b(T^*M)$, of smooth functions on the cotangent bundle, polynomial in the fibers of globally bounded degree. These deformations have a close relation to the family of noncommutative multiplicative structures on the space of modular forms found by P. Cohen, Y. Manin and D. Zagier in [11], and generalize to the non-flat setting earlier work of C. Duval, P. Lecomte, V. Ovsienko and their collaborators. (That such a generalization should be possible was proposed in [14]). The hope is that when properly understood these algebraic structures will point towards an algebraic generalization of the notion of projective structure. Because it works fairly well, the language used is that of deformation quantization, e.g. star products, quantization maps, and so on. It is not clear how natural is this language from a geometric point of view; in particular the notion of isomorphism usually used in deformation quantization is evidently too flabby (topological) to distinguish the star products associated to inequivalent projective structures.

In this introductory section the main theorems are stated. Precise definitions of some of the objects involved appear at the appropriate places in the main body of the text.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is an associative algebra, let $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ be the ring of formal power series in the indeterminate, ϵ , equipped with the ϵ -adic topology. A **star product** on $\mathcal{A}$ is an associative $\mathbb{R}[[\epsilon]]$ -bilinear map

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53D55; Secondary 53A55.

Key words and phrases. Projective Structure, Deformation Quantization, Star Product, Rankin-Cohen Brackets.

During the preparation of this article the author benefited from a visit to the Instituto de Matemáticas y Física Fundamental (IMAFF) del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC) in Madrid, Spain.

$\epsilon \star : \mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]] \times \mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ having as a unit the constant function 1, and such that for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$(1.1) \quad A \epsilon \star B = AB + \sum_{r \geq 1} \epsilon^r B_r(A, B),$$

where the B_r are bilinear operators on $\mathcal{A}$. A star product is called **symmetric** if $B_r(B, A) = (-1)^r B_r(A, B)$ (which is the same as $A \epsilon \star B = B \bar{\epsilon} \star A$ where $\bar{\epsilon} = -\epsilon$), and **commutative** if $A \epsilon \star B = B \epsilon \star A$. The given associative multiplication on $\mathcal{A}$ may be extended ϵ -linearly to all of $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$, and so $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ has as a topological $\mathbb{R}[[\epsilon]]$ -module two different associative multiplicative structures which agree to zeroth order in ϵ . Note that a commutative star product is just a deformation of $\mathcal{A}$ through commutative, associative algebras

A **Poisson bracket** on $\mathcal{A}$ is a Lie bracket, $\{, \}$, satisfying the condition that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, the adjoint operator, $\{A, \}$, is a derivation of $\mathcal{A}$ as an associative algebra. An $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map is an automorphism of the Poisson algebra $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ if it is simultaneously an associative algebra automorphism and a Lie algebra automorphism. A star product on the Poisson algebra $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ is **adapted** to $\{, \}$ provided that $B_1(A, B) - B_1(B, A) = \{A, B\}$.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is graded as an associative algebra, a star product on $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ is called **graded** if for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$, B_r is a graded linear operator in the sense that the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ of B_r takes values in $\mathcal{A}_{k+l-r}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of the algebra of smooth functions, $C^\infty(N)$, on a smooth manifold, N , which is graded as an associative algebra, a star product on $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ is called **graded differential** if it is graded and if for each $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ of B_r is a bidifferential operator of order at most r . As A. Astashkevich and R. Brylinski have explained, [2], for equivariant star products the notion of graded differential star products seems to be the appropriate substitute for differential star products, (they call a graded star product what would be here called a symmetric, graded, $\{, \}$ -adapted star product). Note that if the grading of $\mathcal{A}$ is non-trivial a graded differential star product need not be a differential star product.

A **homomorphism** of star algebras, $(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon \star)$ and $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon \bar{\star})$ will mean a topological $\mathbb{R}[[\epsilon]]$ -module map, $T : \mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{A}}[[\epsilon]]$ such that $T(A \epsilon \star B) = T(A) \epsilon \bar{\star} T(B)$. Such a map has the form $T = \sum_{r \geq 0} \epsilon^r T_r$ where each T_r is the ϵ -linear extension to $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ of a $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map $T_r : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{A}}$. An isomorphism of star algebras is an invertible homomorphism of star algebras. An isomorphism of star algebras for which $T_0 = Id_{\mathcal{A}}$ is called a **gauge equivalence**. (For background on deformation quantization consult the surveys [22], [27]). A **geometric isomorphism** of star algebras, $(\mathcal{A}, \epsilon \star)$ and $(\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \epsilon \bar{\star})$ will mean a bijective $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map, $T : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{A}}$ which when extended ϵ -linearly to a topological $\mathbb{R}[[\epsilon]]$ -module map $T : \mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{A}}[[\epsilon]]$ satisfies $T(A \epsilon \star B) = T(A) \epsilon \bar{\star} T(B)$. By definition a geometric isomorphism of star algebras is a star algebra isomorphism for which $T_r = 0$ if $r \geq 1$. The notion of geometric isomorphism is much more rigid than that of isomorphism (from an algebraic viewpoint this is likely not the ‘right’ notion, but seems adequate for present purposes).

Because the differential of a diffeomorphism acts on the fibers of the cotangent bundle by linear transformations the property of a function on the cotangent bundle being polynomial in each fiber is well-defined. Let $\mathcal{B} = \text{Pol}(T^*M)$ be the Poisson algebra of smooth, fiberwise-polynomial functions on the cotangent bundle of M . An element $a \in \mathcal{B}$ is a smooth function on $C^\infty(T^*M)$ such that for any $x \in M$ the restriction of a to the fiber T_x^*M is a polynomial; in particular, an element of $\mathcal{B}$ need not have globally bounded degree on the fibers. Let $\mathcal{A} = \text{Pol}^b(T^*M)$ be the subalgebra comprising functions of globally bounded fiberwise degree. The subspaces $\mathcal{A}^i \subset \mathcal{A}$ comprising functions polynomial in the fibers of degree at most i are well-defined, and each is graded $\mathcal{A}^i = \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \mathcal{A}_j$, where $\mathcal{A}_j$ comprises functions polynomial in the fibers of degree exactly j . The direct sum $\bigoplus_{i=0}^\infty \mathcal{A}_i$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}$. The tautological Poisson structure, $\{, \}$, on $C^\infty(T^*M)$ restricts to both $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, and the Poisson bracket on $\mathcal{A}$ is graded in the sense that $\{\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_j\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{i+j-1}$. As

an algebra, $\mathcal{B}$, is identified with the space of sections of the bundle, $S(TM)$, of symmetric algebras of the tangent bundle in such a way that the subspace $\mathcal{A}_j$ is canonically identified with the space of sections of the bundle, $S^j(TM)$, of completely symmetric j -vectors. The space of sections, $\mathcal{B}$, of $\oplus_{k=0}^{\infty} S^k(TM)$ and the direct sum, $\oplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \Gamma(S^k(TM)) = \mathcal{A}$ of the spaces of sections are not the same thing; the latter comprises finite formal sums of tensors whereas the former comprises formal sums of tensors finite at any given point of M . When viewed in this way $\mathcal{A}$ will be called the **symmetric tensor algebra**, and also written $\mathcal{S}(M)$. $\mathcal{B}$ contains $\mathcal{A}$ as a subalgebra which is proper if M is noncompact. The space of linear differential operators on $C^\infty(M)$ having globally bounded order is filtered by the subspaces comprising operators of order bounded by a positive integer, and $\mathcal{A}$ can be viewed as the associated graded algebra of this filtered algebra.

A **projective structure** on M is an equivalence class, $[\nabla]$, of torsion-free affine connections such that the unparameterized geodesics of any two representative connections are the same. Two projective structures are equivalent if there is a diffeomorphism of M mapping the geodesics of one structure onto the geodesics of the other structure. The main results of this paper are summarized in the following theorem, the proof of which appears in Section 4.

Theorem 1.1. *There is associated to each (curved) projective structure on a smooth n -dimensional manifold, M , a one-parameter family of graded differential star products, $\epsilon^{\star\mu}$, on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to the tautological Poisson structure, $\{, \}$, such that in the expansion*

$$(1.2) \quad A \epsilon^{\star\mu} B = AB + \frac{\epsilon}{2} (\{A, B\} + (n+1+2\mu)\partial C_1(A, B)) + \sum_{r \geq 2} \epsilon^r B_r^\mu(A, B),$$

- the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ of each of the bilinear operators B_r^μ takes values in $\mathcal{A}_{k+l-r}$;
- viewing $\mathcal{A}_k$ as $S^k(TM)$, the restriction to $S^k(TM) \times S^l(TM)$ of each B_r^μ is a projectively invariant bilinear differential operator of order at most r ;
- each B_r^μ is a polynomial in μ of degree at most r ;
- ∂C_1 (which is symmetric) is the coboundary of the 1-cochain for the Hochschild cohomology of $\mathcal{A}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{A}$ given by $C_1 = \frac{1}{n+1+2\mathbb{L}} \circ D$, where $\mathbb{L}$ is the Euler vector field generating fiber dilations on T^*M ; $\frac{1}{n+1+2\mathbb{L}}$ is interpreted as a formal power series in the Lie derivative, $\mathbb{L}$; and D is the divergence operator on $C^\infty(T^*M)$ determined as in Lemma 3.1 by a choice of representative $\nabla \in [\nabla]$.

These star products satisfy $A \epsilon^{\star\mu} B = B_{-\epsilon^{\star\mu-n-1}} A$, so that $\epsilon^{\star\mu}$ is symmetric if and only if $\mu = -(n+1)/2$, in which case the star product is denoted simply $\epsilon^\star$.

For the weight $\mu = -(n+1)/2$, the star products, $\epsilon^\star$, associated to two projective structures of the same dimension at least 2 are geometrically isomorphic if and only if the underlying projective structures are equivalent. In particular, distinct projective structures determine distinct star products. Any two projective structures determine gauge equivalent star products, $\epsilon^\star$, so that the gauge equivalence class of the star products so determined depends only on the smooth structure on M .

Finally, if $X \in \text{Vec}(M)$ is an infinitesimal automorphism of the projective structure, $[\nabla]$, then $\mathcal{L}_X$ is an inner derivation of the star algebra $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \{, \}, \epsilon^\star)$ associated to $[\nabla]$.

When viewed as operators on $\mathcal{A}$ the B_r are formal pseudo-differential operators rather than differential operators. By Theorem 5.1 of [14] there is in the projectively flat case a unique symmetric, graded-differential, $\{, \}$ -adapted star product on $\mathcal{A}$, which must therefore be the star product $\epsilon^\star$. Thus $\epsilon^\star$ recovers in the flat case the star product described in [24], [15], [14], and [8], (note that in these papers a star product by definition is symmetric and satisfies $B_1 = \frac{1}{2}\{, \}$). That the flat case should have a curved generalization was first suggested by Lecomte and Ovsienko, and is proposed explicitly at the end of [14]. In the non-flat case it is not even clear how one should formulate a

characterization (uniqueness statement) of these star products. On the other hand, even in the flat case the existence proofs given here are different than those of [24]. In one dimension it should be possible to relate the associative multiplications defined on the space of modular forms in [11] to some specialization of $\epsilon \star^\mu$; some suggestions in this direction appear in Example 4.3.

The construction of the projectively invariant star product is based on the construction of what Lecomte - Ovsienko have called a **projectively invariant quantization map**. Let $\mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ be the bundle on M of symmetric k -vectors with $-\frac{\lambda}{n+1}$ -density coefficients. Denote by $\mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda}^k = \text{Hom}(J^k(\mathcal{E}[\mu]), \mathcal{E}[\mu+\lambda])$ the vector space of differential operators of order at most k mapping sections of the bundle, $\mathcal{E}[\mu]$, of $-\frac{\mu}{n+1}$ -densities on M , to sections of $\mathcal{E}[\mu+\lambda]$, and set $\mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda} = \cup_{k=0}^\infty \mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda}^k$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda,k} = \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ (both notations will be used) so that $\mathcal{A}_\lambda = \oplus_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{A}_{\lambda,k}$ is the graded vector space of weighted symmetric polyvectors, which is the associated graded vector space, $Gr \mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda}$ of principal symbols. Call a linear map, $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda}$, a **quantization map**, if for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each $a \in \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ (a^- indicates the space of sections of a vector bundle), $\mathcal{L}(a)$ is a differential operator with principal symbol a . On a manifold with projective structure, $[\nabla]$, a quantization map will be called **projectively invariant**, if for each $a \in \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$, the operator $\mathcal{L}(a)$ is a projectively invariant differential operator. In [24], Lecomte and Ovsienko constructed on any manifold equipped with a flat projective structure a projectively invariant quantization map, and in [5], M. Bordemann extended their construction to manifolds equipped with curved projective structures.

In Theorem 4.1 it is shown that the projectively invariant quantization yields operators which are formally self-adjoint with respect to the canonical pairing between compactly supported μ -densities and $(1-\mu)$ -densities. In particular, the representation on operators on half-densities is by formally self-adjoint operators. In [15] this was proved in the flat case by invoking the uniqueness of the flat projectively invariant quantization map proved in [24]; here the proof is by integration by parts because the proper formulation of a uniqueness statement is lacking. The star products of Theorem 1.1 arise by transporting to $\mathcal{A}$ via the projectively invariant quantization map the structure of the algebra of differential operators acting on densities. For densities of general weight this yields the associative algebra deformations $\epsilon \star^\mu$ of $\mathcal{A}$, and when these differential operators act on half-densities the symmetry of the star product, $\epsilon \star$, of Theorem 1.1 is a consequence of the self-adjointness of the operators.

The coefficients of a projectively invariant quantization map, $\mathcal{L}(a)$, are linear differential operators in the components of a , and so for $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$, $\mathcal{L}(a)(f)$ may be viewed as a projectively invariant bilinear differential operator. Lecomte-Ovsienko's and Bordemann's quantization maps are recovered as special cases of the following general theorem yielding projectively invariant multilinear differential operators.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(M, [\nabla])$ be a smooth n -dimensional manifold with projective structure. Let α be an integer greater than 1. Let $1 \leq \gamma \leq p$; let k_γ be a non-negative integer; let λ_γ be a real number not in the set of **excluded weights**, $\{-n - k_\gamma, \dots, -n - 2k_\gamma + 1\}$; and set $K = \sum_{\gamma=1}^p k_\gamma$ and $\Lambda = \sum_{\gamma=1}^p \lambda_\gamma$. For each integer $1 < \beta \leq K$ there exists a multilinear projectively invariant differential operator of order $K - \beta$:*

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta : \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1})}[\lambda_1] \times \dots \times \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_p})}[\lambda_\alpha] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_\beta)}[\Lambda]$$

Moreover, if $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$ then the principal symbol of $\mathcal{L}_0(a, f)$ viewed as a differential operator in f is a . In particular, if $a^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i$ is a vector field then $\mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = \mathfrak{L}_a f$ where $\mathfrak{L}_a$ is the usual Lie derivative.

In the multilinear case there is lacking an invariant characterization of these operators, though certainly there should be one. Conceptually the proof of Theorem 1.2 is very simple. A projective structure determines on the total space of a $\mathbb{R}^\times$ principal bundle over M a Ricci-flat, torsion-free affine connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, the **Thomas ambient connection**, and for non-excluded weights, λ , an invariant lift of $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ to a contravariant symmetric k -tensor, $\tilde{a}$, of the appropriate homogeneity, and such that $\hat{\nabla}\tilde{a}$ is completely trace-free. The operators of Theorem 1.2 arise by applying repeatedly the connection $\hat{\nabla}$ to the symmetric product of the invariant lifts of the sections of $\mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_\gamma})}[\lambda_\gamma]$, and taking as many traces as is possible. This procedure is explicit in the sense that for any particular example it is straightforward to find explicit expressions for the resulting multilinear differential operators. The sense in which Theorem 1.2 generalizes the Rankin-Cohen brackets as described in [11] or [31] is explained in Section 3.1. Probably the operators $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ generalize the multilinear differential operators on the space of modular forms constructed by R. A. Rankin in [26], but a precise statement is lacking. As is stated precisely in Corollary 2.1, that the weight λ is one of the excluded weights of Theorem 1.2 corresponds to the existence of a projectively invariant differential operator on the bundle $\mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$. These operators arise as the obstruction to the construction of the invariant lift, and are described in Proposition 3.1.

The complicated interaction of the invariant lift with the algebra structure of $\mathcal{A}$ underlies Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Proposition 3.3 shows that the difference between the symmetric product of the invariant lifts of elements of $\mathcal{S}(M)$ and the invariant lift of the symmetric product of the same elements is expressible explicitly in terms of the operators $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ of Theorem 1.2. In some sense this statement characterizes these invariant multilinear differential operators. It also leads to the following theorem proved in Section 4.4.

Theorem 1.3. *The limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} A_{t\star^c/t} B$ exists and defines on $\mathcal{A}$ a commutative, graded differential star product, $\infty\star^c$, having the form*

$$(1.3) \quad A_{\infty\star^c} B = AB + c\partial C_1(A, B) + \sum_{r \geq 2} c^r B_r^\infty(A, B),$$

where for $1 \leq r$ the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ of B_r^∞ has the form

$$(1.4) \quad r!B_r^\infty(a, b) = \frac{\binom{k+l}{r}}{\binom{n+2k+2l-r}{r}} \mathcal{L}_{k+l-r}(a, b).$$

The star product $\infty\star^c$ is new even in the flat case. As is partly proved in Section 4.4, The real part of the specialization at $c = 2i$ of the limiting star products $\infty\star^c$ should recover the commutative multiplication, $m^{(\infty)}$, on the space of modular forms constructed in [11]. A special case of this claim is proved as Example 4.5. It is not clear what is the geometric meaning of $\infty\star^c$.

All the constructions use in an essential way the ambient viewpoint first developed by T. Y. Thomas for projective and conformal structures, [29]. The work of C. Fefferman on invariants of CR structures gave further impetus to this ambient point of view which has played a prominent role in the construction of local invariants and invariant differential operators on manifolds with curved geometric structures. On a manifold with (curved) conformal structure a construction utilizing instead of the Thomas ambient connection the Fefferman-Graham ambient connection and a conformally invariant lift of tensors (e.g. that used by R. Jenne, [23]), ought to lead to conformally invariant star products. Here much of the underlying work of constructing the right sort of conformally invariant multilinear differential operators on trace-free symmetric polyvectors has been done already by M. Eastwood, [16]. Also relevant should be the conformally invariant operators on densities constructed by S. Alexakis in [1], work which built on the earlier study of the flat case made by Eastwood - C. R. Graham, [17]. More generally, it seems plausible that it

should be possible to construct on any manifold equipped with a parabolic geometry an invariant star product. In this context, it would be interesting to know if the projectively invariant star products constructed here can be obtained by transporting one of the standard star products on the symmetric algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$ using the canonical regular normal Cartan connection associated to the projective structure. In Theorem 3.6 of [9], D. Calderbank and T. Diemer construct on manifolds with parabolic geometric structure invariant bilinear differential pairings of sections of the vector bundles associated via the Cartan connection to certain Lie algebra cohomologies. In the setting of projective structures it seems possible that their operators are related in some way to those of Theorem 1.2, though this possibility is not explored here. The nature of the construction in [9] enabled its authors to explore in Section 6 of [9] some complicated (curved A_∞) algebraic structure related to their operators; an analogous understanding of the algebraic structure of the operators of Theorem 1.2 would be desirable.

Theorem 1.1 suggests the possibility of an algebraic broadening of the notion of projective structure. The papers, [12], [13], of A. Connes and H. Moscovici, achieve such a goal in the one-dimensional case. Connes and Moscovici define generalized Rankin-Cohen brackets for any associative algebra equipped with an action of the Hopf algebra of transverse geometry in codimension one such that the derivation corresponding to the Schwarzian derivative is inner. Since the Rankin-Cohen brackets arise as a one-dimensional special case of Theorem 1.2, and the Hopf algebras of transverse geometry are defined in higher dimension, it seems plausible that there could be in all dimensions, and in the non-flat case, an algebraic extension of the notion of projective structure along these lines.

2. REVIEW OF PROJECTIVE STRUCTURES

In this section the basic results concerning projective structures are reviewed, following the approach of T. Y. Thomas, [29]. Some version of much of this material can be found also in various modern sources, for instance [3] or [20].

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ write $a_{(r)} = a(a-1) \dots (a-r+1)$ and $\binom{a}{r} = a_{(r)}/r!$. In tensorial expressions, lowercase Latin indices range over the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ while uppercase Latin indices range over the set $\{\infty, 1, \dots, n\}$. Often the abstract index notation is employed (this should be clear in context), so that expressions with indices have invariant meaning. Complete symmetrization (resp. anti-symmetrization) over a specified set of indices is indicated by enclosing them in parentheses (resp. square brackets). The symmetric product of symmetric polyvectors is denoted $a \odot b$, so that, for example, for vector fields a^i and b^j , $(a \odot b)^{ij} = a^{(i}b^{j)} = \frac{1}{2}(a^ib^j + a^jb^i)$.

For a torsion-free connection, ∇ , denote by $R_{ijk}{}^l$ its curvature tensor, consistent with the convention $2\nabla_{[i}\nabla_{j]}\alpha_k = -R_{ijk}{}^p\alpha_p$. For an arbitrary torsion-free affine connection, ∇ , the tensor $R_{ij} = R_{ipj}{}^p$ need not be symmetric. Define the **projective Schouten tensor**, P_{ij} , by $(n-1)P_{ij} = R_{ij} - \frac{2}{n+1}R_{[ij]}$, and the **projective Weyl tensor**, $B_{ijk}{}^l = R_{ijk}{}^l + 2\delta_{[i}{}^l P_{j]k} - 2P_{[ij]}\delta_k{}^l$. Tracing the first Bianchi identity gives $2(n+1)P_{[ij]} = 2R_{[ij]} = R_{ijp}{}^p$. Torsion-free affine connections have the same unparameterized geodesics if and only if there exists a one-form, γ , so that their difference tensor has the form $2\gamma_{(i}\delta_{j)}{}^k$, in which case $B_{ijk}{}^l$ does not depend on the choice of representative $\nabla \in [\nabla]$. Tracing the second Bianchi identity gives $\nabla_{[i}P_{j]k} = 0$, so that the two-form $P_{[ij]}$ is closed. The curvature of the $\mathbb{R}^\times$ principal connection induced by ∇ on the principal bundle of frames in $\wedge^n(T^*M)$ is a scalar multiple of $-R_{ijp}{}^p = -2(n+1)P_{[ij]}$, which shows that the closed two-form, $-2(n+1)P_{[ij]}$, can be regarded as a scalar multiple of the curvature of the $\mathbb{R}^\times$ principal connection induced by ∇ on this principal bundle. If $\nabla\mu = 0$, then $-R_{ijp}{}^p\mu_{k_1\dots k_n} = 2\nabla_{[i}\nabla_{j]}\mu_{k_1\dots k_n} = 0$, and so by the traced first Bianchi identity, the Ricci tensor of ∇ is symmetric, and so also $P_{[ij]} = 0$.

For any $\nabla \in [\nabla]$, there is a one-form, γ , such that $\nabla\mu = (n+1)\gamma \otimes \mu$. If the difference tensor of $\tilde{\nabla} \in [\nabla]$ with ∇ is $2\gamma \odot \delta$, then $\tilde{\nabla}\mu = \nabla\mu - (n+1)\gamma \otimes \mu = 0$. This shows that given a projective structure, $[\nabla]$, on an orientable manifold, M , for each choice of a volume form, μ , on M there exists a unique $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ making μ parallel. Consequently it suffices to work only with representatives $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ having symmetric Ricci tensor, and this will be henceforth assumed always.

Let F denote the $\mathbb{R}^\times$ principal bundle of frames in the canonical bundle, $\wedge^n(T^*M)$, of the smooth n -dimensional manifold, M . When $n = 2l$ let the $\mathbb{R}^\times$ principal bundle, L , be the unique $\frac{1}{n+1}$ -root of F . When $n = 2l - 1$, assume M is orientable with a fixed orientation, so that the group of F is reduced to $\mathbb{R}^{>0}$, and let L be a choice of $\frac{1}{n+1}$ -root of F . Denote by $\mathcal{E}[\lambda]$ the line bundle associated to L by the representation, $r \cdot s = r^{-\lambda}s$, of $\mathbb{R}^\times$ on $\mathbb{R}$, so that $\mathcal{E}[-1]$ is a $\frac{1}{n+1}$ -root of $\wedge^n(T^*M)$. A section of $\mathcal{E}[\lambda]$ is a $-\lambda/(n+1)$ density. Sections, u , of $\mathcal{E}[\lambda]$ are in canonical bijection with functions $\tilde{u} : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ homogeneous of degree λ . The model for L is the defining bundle $\mathbb{V}_0 = \mathbb{V} - \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{V})$, where $(\mathbb{V}, \Psi)$ is an $n+1$ dimensional real vector space with volume form Ψ . This defining bundle is the bundle of frames in the tautological line bundle over $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{V})$. Write $\mathcal{E}_{j_1 \dots j_l}^{i_1 \dots i_k}[\lambda] = \mathcal{T}^k(TM) \otimes \mathcal{T}^l(T^*M) \otimes \mathcal{E}[\lambda]$. The use of $()$ and $[]$ indicates symmetries, so that, for instance, $\mathcal{E}^{(ij)k}[\lambda]$ indicates weighted 3-vectors symmetric in the first two indices.

Fix a choice of $\rho : L \rightarrow M$. A tautological n -form, α , is defined on L , by

$$\alpha_s(X_1, \dots, X_n) = s_{\rho(s)}^{n+1}(\rho_*(X_1), \dots, \rho_*(X_n)) \quad \text{for } X_1, \dots, X_n \in T_s L.$$

A canonical volume form, Ψ , is defined by $\Psi = d\alpha$. A canonical **Euler vector field**, $\mathbb{X}$, the infinitesimal generator of the fiber dilations on L , is defined by $i(\mathbb{X})\Psi = (n+1)\alpha$.

A torsion-free affine connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, on L , and a choice of section, s , determine on M a torsion-free affine connection, ∇ , defined by $\nabla_X Y = \rho_*(\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \hat{Y})$. If the condition $\hat{\nabla}\mathbb{X} = \delta$ is imposed, it is easily checked that the connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, determined by $\tilde{s} = fs$ has the same unparameterized geodesics as does ∇ . This associates a projective structure on M to each torsion-free affine connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, on L , satisfying $\hat{\nabla}\mathbb{X} = \delta$. It may be checked that if $\hat{\nabla}\Psi = 0$ then ∇ is the unique representative of $[\nabla]$ making $\mu = s^*(\alpha)$ parallel. Two torsion-free connections, $\hat{\nabla}$ and $\hat{\nabla}'$, on L , satisfying $\hat{\nabla}\mathbb{X} = \delta = \hat{\nabla}'\mathbb{X}$ and making parallel Ψ determine on M the same projective structure. The only freedom is in the vertical part of $\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \hat{Y}$, and requiring that $\hat{\nabla}$ be Ricci flat eliminates this freedom.

Theorem 2.1 (T. Y. Thomas, [29]). *Let M be a smooth manifold equipped with a choice of $\rho : L \rightarrow M$. There is a functor associating to each projective structure, $[\nabla]$, on M , a unique torsion-free affine connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, (the Thomas ambient connection) on L satisfying the following conditions:*

1. $\hat{\nabla}\mathbb{X}$ is the fundamental $\binom{1}{1}$ -tensor on L .
2. $\hat{\nabla}\Psi = 0$.
3. $\hat{\nabla}$ is Ricci flat.
4. The projections into M of the unparametrized geodesics of $\hat{\nabla}$ transverse to the vertical are the geodesics of the given projection structure.

The choice of a local section, s , induces on L , a unique $\mathbb{R}^\times$ principal connection, ϕ , such that s is a parallel section and $\phi(\mathbb{X}) = 1$. The connection, ϕ , determines a horizontal lift, $\hat{X}$, of each vector field, X , on M . Condition 4 has the following analytic reformulation.

5. For each (local) section, s , of $\rho : L \rightarrow M$ the connection, ∇ , defined on M by $\nabla_X Y = \rho_*(\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \hat{Y})$, is the unique representative of $[\nabla]$ making the volume form $s^*(\alpha) = s^{n+1}$ parallel.

The theorem is proved first for a neighborhood on M for which $\mathbf{L}$ is trivial. The uniqueness statement in the theorem guarantees that the resulting connections patch together globally on $\mathbf{L}$. To sketch the proof, suppose there is a global section, $s : M \rightarrow \mathbf{L}$. Let $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ be the unique representative of the given projective structure $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ making $\mu = s^*(\alpha)$ parallel. For any symmetric tensor, P_{ij} , conditions (1)-(3) of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied by the connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, defined by requiring it to be torsion-free and to satisfy

$$\hat{\nabla}_V \mathbb{X} = V, \quad \hat{\nabla}_{\hat{X}} \hat{Y} = \widehat{\nabla_X Y} + P(X, Y) \mathbb{X}.$$

Straightforward computation of the curvature of $\hat{\nabla}$ shows that requiring $\hat{\nabla}$ to be Ricci-flat determines P_{ij} uniquely as $P_{ij} = \frac{1}{n-1} R_{ij}$, where $R_{ij} = R_{ipj}{}^p$ is the Ricci tensor of ∇ .

Because the curvature tensor of $\hat{\nabla}$ is horizontal, its components may be regarded as tensors on M . The possibly non-vanishing components are $B_{ijk}{}^l$ and $C_{ijk} = 2\nabla_{[i} P_{j]k}$. The Bianchi identities imply $\nabla_{[i} B_{jk]l}{}^p = -\delta_{[i}{}^p C_{jk]l}$ and $(2-n)C_{ijk} = \nabla_p B_{ijk}{}^p$, so that if $n > 2$ the vanishing of $B_{ijk}{}^l$ implies the vanishing of C_{ijk} and consequently of the curvature of $\hat{\nabla}$. If $n = 2$, $B_{ijk}{}^l = 0$ automatically, and $C_{ijk} = 0$ implies $\hat{\nabla}$ is flat. The Thomas ambient connection contains exactly the same information as does the canonical regular, normal Cartan connection inducing the projective structure, and each may be recovered from the other straightforwardly.

By considering the transformation law for P_{ij} under a change of scale, and considering formal power series, it is not hard to show (see [20]) that there exists at each $x \in M$ a **projective normal scale**, namely a projective scale, s , for which at x there holds $\nabla_{(i_1 \dots i_{k-2}} P_{i_{k-1} i_k)} = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$.

The affine space, $\mathcal{A}(M)$, of projective structures on M is modeled on the space of trace-free sections of $\mathcal{E}_{(ij)}^k$. The difference tensor of two projective structures is defined by the observation that the difference tensor of the unique representatives of the projective structures making parallel a given projective scale does not depend on the choice of scale. The action of the group, $\text{Diff}(M)$, of diffeomorphisms of M on $\mathcal{A}(M)$ is defined by pullback of differential operators as $\phi \cdot [\nabla] = [\phi^* \circ \nabla \circ (\phi^*)^{-1}]$. Differentiating this action along a one-parameter subgroup yields the action on $\mathcal{A}(M)$ of the Lie algebra, $\text{Vec}(M)$, of vector fields on M , as the Lie derivative, $\mathcal{L}_X[\nabla]$, of a projective structure along a vector field, X . In terms of a representative connection $\nabla \in [\nabla]$, $\mathcal{L}_X \nabla$ equals the trace-free part of $\nabla_i \nabla_j X^k - X^p R_{pij}{}^k$, which is easily checked to be a projectively invariant differential operator. The difference $\phi \cdot [\nabla] - [\nabla]$ is a non-trivial cocycle of $\text{Diff}(M)$, sometimes called the **Schwarzian derivative** (determined by $[\nabla]$) of ϕ . The Schwarzian cocycles associated to different choices of projective structure are cohomologous, and so there is a canonical Schwarzian cohomology class determined solely by the smooth structure on M . This seems related to the conclusion of Theorem 4.3 that the projectively invariant star products determined by different projective structures are gauge equivalent.

Each (local) section, s , of $\mathbf{L}$ determines a trivialization of $\mathbf{L}$; a horizontal lift of vector fields, $X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ from M to $\mathbf{L}$; a volume form $\mu = s^{n+1}$; and a unique representative $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ such that $\nabla \mu = 0$. Each $\phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ has a canonical lift to a principal bundle automorphism $\tilde{\phi} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{L})$, and this induces a canonical lift of vector fields associating to each $X \in \text{Vec}(M)$ the homogeneity 0 vector field on $\mathbf{L}$ expressible as

$$(2.1) \quad \tilde{X} = \hat{X} - \frac{1}{n+1} \text{div}_\mu(X) \mathbb{X} = \tilde{X} = \hat{X} - \frac{1}{n+1} \text{tr}(\nabla X) \mathbb{X}.$$

$\tilde{X}$ is determined uniquely by the requirements that $\rho_*(\tilde{X}) = X$, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{X}} \tilde{X} = 0$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{X}} \Psi = 0$ (Equivalently $\text{tr} \hat{\nabla} \tilde{X} = 0$). While the invariant lift is a linear map, it is not a C^∞ -module homomorphism; precisely, $\widetilde{fX} = f\tilde{X} - \frac{1}{n+1} df(X) \mathbb{X}$. As a consequence, the invariant lift of vector fields does not induce directly an invariant lift of polyvectors. However expressing the identity $\mathcal{L}_A \Psi = 0$ in terms

of the ambient connection as $\text{tr } \hat{\nabla} A = 0$ suggests that a projective structure should determine an invariant lift of completely symmetric polyvectors as follows. Call $\tilde{a} \in S^k(T\mathbb{L})$ a lift of $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ if for any $\theta^1, \dots, \theta^k \in \Gamma(T^*M)$, $\tilde{a}(\rho^*(\theta^1), \dots, \rho^*(\theta^k))$ is the homogeneity λ function on $\mathbb{L}$ corresponding to the density $a(\theta^1, \dots, \theta^k)$. The invariant lift, $\tilde{a}$, of $a \in \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$ is determined uniquely by the requirements $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathbb{X}} \tilde{a} = 0$ and $\text{tr } \hat{\nabla} \tilde{a} = 0$. More generally, it is possible to lift weighted symmetric polyvectors, except for a discrete set of excluded weights which correspond to the existence of projectively invariant differential operators obtained by taking appropriate combinations of the complete traces of some number of covariant derivatives of a section of $\mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$. The existence of the lift described in Proposition 2.1 was proved already by M. Bordemann in [5].

Proposition 2.1. *Let $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$. If $\lambda \notin \{-n - k - m : 0 \leq m \leq k - 1\}$ there is a projectively invariant lift, $\tilde{a} \in \Gamma(S^k(T\mathbb{L}))$, characterized uniquely by the requirements $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathbb{X}} \tilde{a} = \lambda \tilde{a}$ and $\text{tr } \hat{\nabla} \tilde{a} = 0$.*

For each excluded weight, $\lambda = -n - k - m$, there exists a projectively invariant differential operator, $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_m)}[\lambda]$, so that for any $\nabla \in [\nabla]$, $\mathcal{K}$ has the form

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{K}(a)^{i_1 \dots i_m} = \nabla_{j_1} \dots \nabla_{j_{k-m}} a^{i_1 \dots i_m j_1 \dots j_{k-m}} + \sum_{s=2}^{k-m} C_{i_1 \dots i_s}^s \nabla_{j_1} \dots \nabla_{j_{k-m-s}} a^{i_1 \dots i_s j_1 \dots j_{k-m-s}},$$

where C^s is a polynomial in P_{ij} and the completely symmetrized covariant derivatives of P_{ij} of order at most $s - 2$.

Proof. In this proof, as opposed to in the rest of the paper, a local frame will be chosen and indices will refer to the chosen frame and dual coframe. Let $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ be the representative associated to a choice of local section $s : M \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$. Let E_i and θ^j be a local frame and dual coframe on the base, and take a coframe ϕ^I on $\mathbb{L}$ where $\phi^i = \rho^*(\theta^i)$ and ϕ^∞ is the principal connection determined by the scale, s (so that on $\mathbb{L}$ a dual frame is given by $F_i = \hat{E}_i$ and $F_\infty = \mathbb{X}$). The first two requirements mean that if $\tilde{a}$ is to exist there exist $a_m = a_m^{i_1 \dots i_m} E_{i_1} \odot \dots \odot E_{i_m} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_m)}[\lambda]$ such that $\tilde{a}$ can be written in the form

$$(2.3) \quad \tilde{a} = \sum_{m=0}^k \tilde{a}_m^{i_1 \dots i_m} \hat{E}_{i_1} \odot \dots \odot \hat{E}_{i_m} \odot \mathbb{X}^{k-m}, \quad \mathbb{X}^{k-m} = \mathbb{X} \odot \dots \odot \mathbb{X},$$

where $\tilde{a}_m^{i_1 \dots i_m}$ is the homogeneity λ function on $\mathbb{L}$ corresponding to the components $a_m^{i_1 \dots i_m}$, which are viewed as densities on M . The condition $\text{tr } \hat{\nabla} \tilde{a} = 0$ gives for each $1 \leq m \leq k - 1$ a linear equation relating a_{m-1} , a_m , and a_{m+1} , and for $m = k$ a linear equation relating a_{m-1} and a_m . If $-\lambda \notin \{n + k, n + k + 1, \dots, n + 2k - 1\}$ these equations may be solved for a_{m-1} . Explicitly one obtains the identities:

$$(2.4) \quad (\lambda + n + 2k - 1) a_{k-1}^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} = -k \nabla_p a_k^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p}, \quad \text{and, for } 1 \leq m \leq k - 1,$$

$$(2.5) \quad (\lambda + n + m + k - 1) a_{m-1}^{i_1 \dots i_{m-1}} = -\frac{m}{k-m+1} (\nabla_p a_m^{i_1 \dots i_{m-1} p} + (m+1) a_{m+1}^{i_1 \dots i_{m-1} p q} P_{pq}).$$

To obtain (2.4) and (2.5) proceed as follows. Write $\tilde{a}$ as in (2.3). Then $\binom{k}{m} \tilde{a}^{i_1 \dots i_m \infty \dots \infty} = \tilde{a}_m^{i_1 \dots i_m}$. As $\hat{\nabla}_{\mathbb{X}} \tilde{a} = (\lambda + k) \tilde{a}$, there follows

$$(2.6) \quad \binom{k}{m} \hat{\nabla}_{\infty} \tilde{a}^{i_1 \dots i_m \infty \dots \infty} = (\lambda + k) \tilde{a}_m^{i_1 \dots i_m},$$

where the expression on the left hand side refers to components of $\hat{\nabla}_{\mathbb{X}}\tilde{a}$ with respect to the chosen frame and dual coframe. Likewise careful handling of the symmetrization operator yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{E}_i}\tilde{a} &= \sum_{m=0}^k \hat{\nabla}_{\hat{E}_i}(\tilde{a}_m^{i_1\dots i_m})\hat{E}_{i_1} \odot \dots \odot \hat{E}_{i_m} \odot \mathbb{X}^{k-m} + \sum_{m=1}^k m\tilde{a}_m^{i_1\dots i_m}(\widehat{\nabla_{E_i}E_{i_1}}) \odot \dots \odot \hat{E}_{i_m} \odot \mathbb{X}^{k-m} \\ &+ \sum_{m=1}^k m\tilde{a}_m^{i_1\dots i_{m-1}p}P_{ip}\hat{E}_{i_1} \odot \dots \odot \hat{E}_{i_{m-1}} \odot \mathbb{X}^{k-m+1} \\ &+ \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} (k-m)\tilde{a}_m^{(i_1\dots i_m}\delta_i^{i_{m+1}})\hat{E}_{i_1} \odot \dots \odot \hat{E}_{i_{m+1}} \odot \mathbb{X}^{k-m-1}.\end{aligned}$$

It will make formulas easier to read if notation is abused in that there is dropped in expressions such as $\tilde{a}_m^{i_1\dots i_m}$ the $\sim$, so that there is written, for instance, $\binom{k}{m}\tilde{a}^{i_1\dots i_m\infty\dots\infty} = a_m^{i_1\dots i_m}$. The preceeding computation of $\hat{\nabla}_{\hat{E}_i}\tilde{a}$ implies the identities

$$(2.7) \quad \hat{\nabla}_i\tilde{a}^{i_1\dots i_k} = \nabla_i a_k^{i_1\dots i_k} + a_{k-1}^{(i_1\dots i_{k-1}}\delta_i^{i_k)}, \quad \text{and, for } 1 \leq m \leq k-1,$$

$$(2.8) \quad \binom{k}{m}\hat{\nabla}_i\tilde{a}^{i_1\dots i_m\infty\dots\infty} = \nabla_i a_m^{i_1\dots i_m} + (k-m+1)a_{m-1}^{(i_1\dots i_{m-1}}\delta_i^{i_m}) + (m+1)a_{m+1}^{i_1\dots i_m p}P_{ip}.$$

Taking a trace and manipulating coefficients gives (2.4) and (2.5). This completes the proof of the existence of the invariant lift for non-excluded weights.

If $\lambda = -n - k - m$ with $m \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ then one can look for $\tilde{a}$ of the form (2.3) and satisfying the condition $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathbb{X}}\tilde{a} = \lambda\tilde{a}$. Imposing for $m < \gamma < k$ the conditions $\hat{\nabla}_Q\tilde{a}^{i_1\dots i_\gamma Q\infty\dots\infty} = 0$, gives equations of the form (2.4) and (2.5) which determine uniquely the components $a_\gamma^{i_1\dots i_\gamma}$ for $\gamma > m$. Moreover, the components $\hat{\nabla}_Q\tilde{a}^{i_1\dots i_m Q\infty\dots\infty}$ are determined uniquely as is seen easily using (2.7) and (2.8); solving inductively for the components $a_m^{i_1\dots i_m}$ in terms of $a^{i_1\dots i_k}$ shows that they are expressible as an invariant differential operator of order $k-m$ applied to $a^{i_1\dots i_k}$; having top order piece a constant multiple of the top order piece of $\nabla_{j_1}\dots\nabla_{j_{k-m}}a^{i_1\dots i_m j_1\dots j_{k-m}}$; and having terms of order $0 \leq s \leq k-m-2$ as in (2.2) which are expressible as polynomials in P_{ij} and its covariant derivatives of order at most s . Since any appearance of P_{ij} and its covariant derivatives is contracted completely with a completely symmetric tensor built from a and its covariant derivatives, any covariant derivative of P_{ij} may be replaced by its complete symmetrization. $\square$

Remark 2.1. In the case of excluded weights the conditions imposed in the proof of Proposition 2.1 do not determine the components $a_s^{i_1\dots i_s}$ for $s \leq m$, and these components may be chosen arbitrarily if it is desired to construct some lift of a . Such a lift will be invariant modulo $\mathbb{X}^{k-m}$.

Remark 2.2. In general there should exist an invariant lift of weighted contravariant tensors having symmetries described by a given Young diagram except for a set of excluded weights that can be read off from the Young diagram. Excluded weights should correspond to the existence of projectively invariant differential operators. For example, except for the excluded weight $\lambda = -n - 2k + 1$, $a^{i_1\dots i_k} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{[i_1\dots i_k]}[\lambda]$ admits the invariant lift

$$\tilde{a} = \widetilde{a^{i_1\dots i_k}}\hat{E}_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{E}_{i_k} - \frac{k}{\lambda+n+2k-1}\nabla_p\widetilde{a^{i_1\dots i_{k-1}p}}\hat{E}_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{E}_{i_{k-1}} \wedge \mathbb{X},$$

where here the wedge product means complete antisymmetrization of the tensor product. The operator $\mathcal{K} : \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{[i_1\dots i_k]}[\lambda] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{[i_1\dots i_{k-1}]}[\lambda]$ defined by $\mathcal{K}(a) = \nabla_p a^{i_1\dots i_{k-1}p}$ is projectively invariant if and only if $\lambda = -n - 2k + 1$.

Remark 2.3. Something like the invariant lift has appeared in previous papers treating conformal and projective invariants and invariant differential operators. In the note [28], Thomas defined a conformally invariant lift of weighted covariant skew-symmetric two-tensors (he called the lift ‘completing the tensor’). In his thesis, [23], Jenne used the conformally invariant lift of symmetric tensors to construct conformally invariant multilinear differential operators on weighted tensors. In eq. (33) of [20], R. Gover uses a projectively invariant lift of an unweighted tensor of curvature tensor type. Similar constructions have been used, usually implicitly, in various works exploiting the ambient point of view, e.g. by Eastwood, C. Fefferman, Gover, Graham, K. Hirachi, etc. . .

Example 2.1. When $k = 1$, (2.4) gives $(\lambda + n + 1)a_0 = -\nabla_p a_1^p$. When $\lambda = 0$, this recovers (2.1). The role of the excluded weight $-n - 1$ is indicated by the observation that the operator $\mathcal{K} : \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i[\lambda] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda]$ given by $\mathcal{K}(a^i) = \nabla_p a^p$ is projectively invariant if and only if $\lambda = -n - 1$.

Example 2.2. When $k = 2$, (2.4) and (2.5) give

$$(\lambda + n + 3)a_1^i = -2\nabla_p a_2^{ip} \quad -2(\lambda + n + 2)a_0 = \nabla_p a_1^p + 2a_2^{pq} P_{pq},$$

so that if $\lambda \notin \{-n - 2, -n - 3\}$ the invariant lift of $a^{ij} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ij)}[\lambda]$ is defined by $a_1^i = -\frac{2}{\lambda + n + 3}\nabla_p a^{ip}$ and $a_0 = \frac{1}{(\lambda + n + 3)(2)}\nabla_p \nabla_q a^{pq} - \frac{1}{(\lambda + n + 2)}a^{pq} P_{pq}$. The excluded weights have the following significance. The differential operator $a^{ij} \rightarrow \nabla_p a^{ip}$ defined on $\mathcal{E}^{(ij)}[\lambda]$ is invariant if and only if $\lambda = -n - 3$, and the differential operator $a^{ij} \rightarrow \nabla_p \nabla_q a^{pq} - a^{pq} P_{pq}$ defined on $\mathcal{E}^{(ij)}[\lambda]$ is invariant if and only if $\lambda = -n - 2$.

Example 2.3. When $k = 3$, (2.4) and (2.5) give

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda + n + 5)a_2^{ij} &= -3\nabla_p a^{ijp}, & (\lambda + n + 4)a_1^i &= -\nabla_p a_2^{ip} - 3a^{ipq} P_{pq}, \\ (\lambda + n + 3)a_0 &= -\frac{1}{3}(\nabla_p a_1^p + 2a_2^{pq} P_{pq}), \end{aligned}$$

so that if $\lambda \notin \{-n - 3, -n - 4, -n - 5\}$ the invariant lift of $a^{ijk} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ijk)}[\lambda]$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} a_2^{ij} &= -\frac{3}{\lambda + n + 5}\nabla_p a^{ijp}, \\ a_1^i &= \frac{3}{(\lambda + n + 5)(2)}\nabla_p \nabla_q a^{ipq} - \frac{3}{(\lambda + n + 4)}a^{ipq} P_{pq}, \\ a_0 &= \frac{-1}{(\lambda + n + 5)(3)}\nabla_p \nabla_q \nabla_r a^{pqr} + \frac{1}{(\lambda + n + 4)(2)}a^{pqr} \nabla_p P_{qr} + \frac{1}{(\lambda + n + 5)}(3 + \frac{1}{(\lambda + n + 4)})P_{qr} \nabla_p a^{pqr} \end{aligned}$$

The following differential operators corresponding to the excluded weights are invariant:

$$\begin{aligned} a^{ijk} &\rightarrow \nabla_p a^{ijp} && \text{for } a^{ijk} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ijk)}[-n - 5], \\ a^{ijk} &\rightarrow \nabla_p \nabla_q a^{ipq} - P_{pq} a^{ipq} && \text{for } a^{ijk} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ijk)}[-n - 4], \\ a^{ijk} &\rightarrow \nabla_p \nabla_q \nabla_r a^{pqr} - 4P_{pq} \nabla_r a^{pqr} - 2a^{pqr} \nabla_p P_{qr} && \text{for } a^{ijk} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ijk)}[-n - 3]. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.1 (Corollary of Proposition 2.1). *If $[\nabla]$ admits a Ricci-flat representative, ∇ , then for $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ (where λ is not an excluded weight)*

$$(2.9) \quad a_{k-m}^{i_1 \dots i_{k-m}} = \frac{(-1)^m \binom{k}{m}}{(\lambda + n + 2k - 1)_{(m)}} \nabla_{j_1} \dots \nabla_{j_m} a^{i_1 \dots i_{k-m} j_1 \dots j_m}.$$

For a general $[\nabla]$, if $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ is the representative associated to a projective normal scale at $x \in M$ then at the point x there holds (2.9).

Proof. When $[\nabla]$ admits a Ricci-flat representative it is straightforward to solve (2.4) and (2.5) to obtain explicit formulas for the a_m . This appears already in M. Bordemann's [5]. For general $[\nabla]$ solving (2.4) and (2.5) yields an expression for a_m which differs from (2.9) only by a sum of terms expressible of the form a contraction of the covariant derivative of a of order at most $0 \leq r \leq k-m-2$ with a covariant derivative of P_{ij} of order r . Since the coefficient of any appearance of covariant derivatives of P_{ij} is completely symmetric, such a term vanishes in a projective normal scale at x . $\square$

3. PROJECTIVELY INVARIANT MULTILINEAR DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Define $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ by

$$(3.1) \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_\beta(a_1, \dots, a_p)}^{i_1 \dots i_\beta} = \hat{\nabla}_{P_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{P_{K-\beta}} (\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p)^{(i_1 \dots i_\beta P_1 \dots P_{K-\beta})}.$$

The special case $\mathcal{L}_0 : \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda] \otimes \mathcal{E}[\mu] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}[\lambda + \mu]$ has the form

$$(3.2) \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a, f)} = \hat{\nabla}_{Q_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{Q_k} (\tilde{f} \tilde{a})^{Q_1 \dots Q_k} = \tilde{a}^{Q_1 \dots Q_k} \hat{\nabla}_{Q_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{Q_k} \tilde{f},$$

where the second equality follows from $\text{tr } \hat{\nabla} \tilde{a} = 0$. From this and the explicit expressions for the components $\tilde{a}^{Q_1 \dots Q_n}$ it is apparent that the principal symbol of $\mathcal{L}_0(a, f)$, viewed as a differential operator on $\mathcal{E}[\mu]$, is $a^{i_1 \dots i_k}$. If $a^i \in \mathcal{E}^i[\lambda]$, then

$$\mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = a^p \nabla_p f - \frac{\mu}{(n+1+\lambda)} f \nabla_p a^p.$$

In particular, if $\lambda = 0$, this shows $\mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = \mathcal{L}_a f$. $\square$

Remark 3.1. A construction using complete contractions as in (3.1) has been used repeatedly in the construction of conformal and projective invariants. The idea goes back to H. Weyl, [30]. Examples of other papers utilizing such a construction are [18], [20], [23], [4], [1], and [19] (this list is by no means complete).

The definition (3.2) is constructive in the sense that it is in principle straightforward to compute the complicated explicit expression for $\mathcal{L}_\beta$. To illustrate this some examples are given now. It will be useful to note that, for $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$,

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbb{X}^{J_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{J_l} \hat{\nabla}_{J_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{J_l} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_k} \tilde{f} = (\mu - k)_{(l)} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_k} f.$$

Example 3.1. For $s = 1, 2$ let $a_s \in \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_s})}[\lambda_s]$ and write $K = k_1 + k_2$. Then

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{K-1}(a_1, a_2)^{i_1 \dots i_{K-1}} &= \frac{k_1}{K} a_1^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k_1-1})} \nabla_p a_2^{i_{k_1} \dots i_{K-1}} + \frac{k_2}{K} a_2^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k_2-1})} \nabla_p a_1^{i_{k_2} \dots i_{K-1}} \\ &\quad - \frac{k_2(\lambda_1 + 2k_1)}{K(\lambda_2 + n + 2k_2 - 1)} a_1^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1})} \nabla_p a_2^{i_{k_1+1} \dots i_{K-1} p} - \frac{k_1(\lambda_2 + 2k_2)}{K(\lambda_1 + n + 2k_1 - 1)} a_2^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_2})} \nabla_p a_1^{i_{k_2+1} \dots i_{K-1} p}. \end{aligned}$$

To show (3.4) observe that, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_{K-1}(a_1, a_2)}^{i_1 \dots i_{K-1}} &= \hat{\nabla}_I \tilde{a}_1^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1})} \tilde{a}_2^{i_{k_1+1} \dots i_{K-1} I)} \\ &= \frac{k_1}{K} \tilde{a}_1^{I(i_1 \dots i_{k_1-1})} \hat{\nabla}_I \tilde{a}_2^{i_{k_1} \dots i_{K-1}} + \frac{k_2}{K} \tilde{a}_1^{I(i_1 \dots i_{k_2-1})} \hat{\nabla}_I \tilde{a}_2^{i_{k_2} \dots i_{K-1} I)}. \end{aligned}$$

This is straightforward to evaluate explicitly using (2.4), (2.6), and (2.7), and the result is (3.4). For $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1})}[\lambda_1]$ and $b \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_2})}[\lambda_2]$, examples of (3.4) are

$\mathcal{L}_{K-1}(a, b)^{i_1 \dots i_{K-1}}$	k_1	k_2
$a^{i_1 \dots i_s p} \nabla_p b - \frac{\lambda_2}{(n+2s-1+\lambda_1)} b \nabla_p a^{p i_1 \dots i_s}$	s	0
$\frac{1}{2} a^p \nabla_p b^i + \frac{1}{2} b^p \nabla_p a^i - \frac{(\lambda_1+2)}{2(n+2+\lambda_2)} a^i \nabla_p b^p - \frac{(\lambda_2+2)}{2(n+2+\lambda_1)} b^i \nabla_p a^p$	1	1

Example 3.2. Let $a^{ij} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ij)}[\lambda]$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a, f)} = \hat{\nabla}_P \hat{\nabla}_Q (\tilde{f} \tilde{a})^{PQ} = \tilde{a}^{PQ} \hat{\nabla}_P \hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{f}$. Straightforward computations yield

$$\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{\nabla}_j \tilde{f} = \nabla_i \nabla_j \tilde{f} - \mu P_{ij} f = \widetilde{L_{ij} f},$$

and from this and (3.3) there follows

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = a^{pq} \nabla_p \nabla_q f + \frac{2(1-\mu)}{(\lambda+n+3)} \nabla_p a^{pq} \nabla_q f + \frac{\mu(2)}{(\lambda+n+3)_{(2)}} f \nabla_p \nabla_q a^{pq} - \frac{\mu(\lambda+\mu+n+1)}{(\lambda+n+2)} a^{pq} P_{pq} f,$$

recovering Theorem 5.3 of [6]. When $\mu = 1$, the operator $L_{(ij)} f$ is projectively invariant, and $\mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = a^{ij} L_{(ij)} f$.

Example 3.3. Let $a^{ijk} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ijk)}[\lambda]$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a, f)} = \tilde{a}^{PQR} \hat{\nabla}_P \hat{\nabla}_Q \hat{\nabla}_R \tilde{f}$. Straightforward computations yield

$$\hat{\nabla}_i \hat{\nabla}_j \hat{\nabla}_k \tilde{f} = \nabla_i \nabla_j \nabla_k \tilde{f} - \mu f \widetilde{\nabla_i P_{jk}} + 2(1-\mu) \widetilde{P_{i(j} \nabla_{k)} f} - \mu \widetilde{P_{jk} \nabla_i f} = \widetilde{L_{ijk} f},$$

and from this and (3.3) there follows straightforwardly

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(a, f) &= a^{ijk} \nabla_i \nabla_j \nabla_k f + \frac{3(2-\mu)}{(\lambda+n+5)} (\nabla_p a^{ijp}) \nabla_i \nabla_j f \\ &+ ((2-3\mu) - \frac{3(\mu-1)_{(2)}}{(\lambda+n+4)}) a^{ijk} P_{ij} \nabla_k f + \frac{3(\mu-1)_{(2)}}{(\lambda+n+5)_{(2)}} (\nabla_p \nabla_q a^{ipq}) \nabla_i f \\ &+ \left(-\frac{\mu(3)}{(\lambda+n+5)_{(3)}} \nabla_i \nabla_j \nabla_k a^{ijk} + \mu \left(\frac{(\mu-1)_{(2)}}{(\lambda+n+4)_{(2)}} - 1 \right) a^{ijk} \nabla_i P_{jk} + \frac{\mu(\mu-2)}{(\lambda+n+5)} (3\mu + \frac{(\mu-1)}{(\lambda+n+4)}) P_{ij} \nabla_p a^{ijp} \right) f \end{aligned}$$

recovering Theorem 2.1 of [7]. When $\mu = 2$ the operator $L_{(ijk)} f$ is projectively invariant and $\mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = a^{ijk} L_{(ijk)} f$.

Example 3.4. Let $a^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i[\mu]$ and $b^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i[\lambda]$. The differential operator $\mathcal{L}_0 : \mathcal{E}^i[\mu] \times \mathcal{E}^i[\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}[\mu + \lambda]$ is computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a, b)} &= \hat{\nabla}_P \hat{\nabla}_Q (\tilde{a} \odot \tilde{b})^{PQ} = (\hat{\nabla}_P \tilde{a}^Q) (\hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{b}^P) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{a}^P \hat{\nabla}_Q \hat{\nabla}_P \tilde{b}^Q + \tilde{b}^P \hat{\nabla}_P \hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{a}^Q \right), \\ &= (\hat{\nabla}_P \tilde{a}^Q) (\hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{b}^P), \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\nabla}_P \hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{b}^P = 0$ follows from $\hat{\nabla}_P \tilde{b}^P = 0$ and the fact that $\hat{\nabla}$ is Ricci flat. This yields

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(a, b) &= (\nabla_p a^q) (\nabla_q b^p) - \frac{\mu+1}{(n+1+\lambda)} a^p \nabla_p \nabla_q b^q - \frac{\lambda+1}{(n+1+\mu)} b^p \nabla_p \nabla_q a^q \\ &+ \frac{\mu\lambda-n-1}{(n+1+\mu)(n+1+\lambda)} (\nabla_p a^p) (\nabla_q b^q) + (\mu + \lambda + 2) a^{(p} b^{q)} P_{pq}. \end{aligned}$$

It is interesting to note the following. The differential operator $K : \mathcal{E}^i[\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_i^j[\lambda]$ defined by $b^i \rightarrow K(b)_i^j = \nabla_i b^j - \frac{1}{n} \delta_i^j (\nabla_p b^p)$ is invariant if and only if $\lambda = -1$. For $\lambda = \mu = -1$ it is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{L}_0(a, b) = K(a)_p^q K(b)_q^p$ and $2\mathcal{L}_1(a, b)^i = b^p K(a)_p^i + a^p K(b)_p^i$.

Proposition 3.1. *If $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k+1})}[\lambda]$ for a non-excluded weight λ , and $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[k]$, then $\mathcal{L}_0(a, u) = a^{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u$ for a projectively invariant differential operator, $L : \mathcal{E}[k] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{(i_1 \dots i_{k+1})}[k]$. For each choice of projective scale, L has the form*

$$(3.7) \quad L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = \nabla_{(i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+1})} u + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} C_{(i_1 \dots i_{s+2}}^s \nabla_{i_{s+3}} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+1})} u,$$

where $C_{i_1 \dots i_{s+2}}^s$ is a polynomial in P_{ij} and its completely symmetrized covariant derivatives of order at most s . Moreover there is a bijective linear map associating to each solution, $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[k]$, of the equation $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = 0$ a homogeneity k tensor $\beta \in S^k(T^*L)$ satisfying $\hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \beta_{I_2 \dots I_{k+1})} = 0$ and $\mathbb{X}^{I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \hat{\nabla}_{J_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{J_s} \beta_{I_1 \dots I_k} = 0$ for every $\{i_1, \dots, i_s\} \subset \{1, \dots, l\}$.

Proof. For $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda]$, and a choice of projective scale define $\widetilde{L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}}} u = \hat{\nabla}_{(i_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{i_{k+1})} \tilde{u}$. In general this depends on the choice of projective scale. By (3.3), $\mathbb{X}^{I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+1}} \tilde{u} = 0$ for every non-empty subset $\{i_1, \dots, i_s\} \subset \{1, \dots, k+1\}$ if and only if $\lambda = k$, so that if $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[k]$, then $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u$ is a projectively invariant differential operator. In this case, by definition of $\mathcal{L}_\beta$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a, u)} = \tilde{a}^{I_1 \dots I_{k+1}} \hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+1})} \tilde{u} = \tilde{a}^{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} \hat{\nabla}_{(i_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{i_{k+1})} \tilde{u}$, so that $\mathcal{L}_0(a, u) = a^{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u$. It is straightforward to check that for $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda]$

$$L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = \nabla_{(i_1} L_{i_2 \dots i_{k+1})} u + k(k-1-\lambda) P_{(i_1 i_2} L_{i_3 \dots i_{k+1})} u,$$

and with this and $L_{ij} u = \nabla_i \nabla_j u - \lambda P_{ij} u$, an obvious inductive argument shows (3.7).

If $u \in \mathcal{E}[k]$ solves $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = 0$, let $\beta_{I_1 \dots I_k} = \hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_k)} \tilde{u}$. By assumption and the preceding discussion, $\hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \beta_{I_2 \dots I_{k+1})} = \hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+1})} \tilde{u} = 0$. Similarly, (3.3) implies

$$\mathbb{X}^{I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \hat{\nabla}_{J_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{J_s} \beta_{I_1 \dots I_k} = \mathbb{X}^{I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \hat{\nabla}_{J_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{J_s} \hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_k)} \tilde{u} = 0.$$

Conversely, given β of homogeneity k satisfying the given conditions, define $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[k]$ by $k! \tilde{u} = \mathbb{X}^{I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_k} \beta_{I_1 \dots I_k}$. Differentiating $\tilde{u}$ repeatedly yields $\hat{\nabla}_{(I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_k)} \tilde{u} = \beta_{I_1 \dots I_k}$ and $\hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+1}} \tilde{u} = 0$, so that $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = 0$. $\square$

At least the existence of L must have been known to the authors of [3].

Corollary 3.1. *If $u \in \mathcal{E}[k]$ and $v \in \mathcal{E}[l]$ are solutions of the projectively invariant equations $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = 0$ and $L_{i_1 \dots i_{l+1}} v = 0$, then $w = uv \in \mathcal{E}[k+l]$ is a solution of $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+l+1}} w = 0$.*

Proof. By assumption $\hat{\nabla}_{(i_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{i_{k+1})} \tilde{u} = 0$ and $\hat{\nabla}_{(i_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{i_{l+1})} \tilde{v} = 0$. As $\widetilde{uv} = \tilde{u}\tilde{v}$, each term of $\hat{\nabla}_{(i_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{i_{k+l+1})} \widetilde{uv}$ involves the complete symmetrization of either at least $k+1$ derivatives of $\tilde{u}$ or at least $l+1$ derivatives of $\tilde{v}$, so must vanish. $\square$

Corollary 3.1 reflects that in the flat model case the space of solutions of $L_{i_1 \dots i_{k+1}} u = 0$ is canonically identified with the k th symmetric power of the standard representation, $\mathcal{L}$, of $\mathfrak{sl}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$ (λ is not an excluded weight) and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$. If $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ is a Ricci flat representative then on M there holds*

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{L}_\beta(a, f) = \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\binom{k-\beta-1-\mu}{m} \binom{k-\beta}{m}}{\binom{n+2k-1+\lambda}{m}} (\nabla_{j_1} \dots \nabla_{j_m} a^{i_1 \dots i_{k-\beta-m} j_1 \dots j_m}) (\nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k-\beta-m}} f).$$

For a general $[\nabla]$, if $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ is the representative associated to a projective normal scale at $x \in M$ then at the point x there holds (3.8).

Proof. In the case that $[\nabla]$ admits a Ricci flat representative, using (2.9) and (3.3) it is not hard to show that (3.8) holds everywhere. For the most important case, $\beta = 0$, this was shown by M. Bordemann, [5]. From the definition of $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ and $\hat{\nabla}$ and the reasoning of the proof of Proposition 3.1 it is apparent that in general the explicit expression for $\mathcal{L}_\beta(a, f)$ can differ from that holding in the Ricci flat case only by terms of order at most $k - \beta - 2$ in f . Moreover, for $0 \leq s \leq k - \beta - 2$, the coefficient of a term containing $\nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_s} f$ is a polynomial in a and its covariant derivatives of order at most $k - \beta - s$ and in P_{ij} and its covariant derivatives of order at most $k - \beta - 2 - s$. Every appearance of $\nabla_{i_1 \dots i_r} P_{jk}$ is contracted with expressions involving a and its covariant derivatives, all of which are completely symmetric, and so every appearance of $\nabla_{i_1 \dots i_r} P_{jk}$ in the expression for $\mathcal{L}_\beta(a, f)$ can be replaced by $\nabla_{(i_1 \dots i_r} P_{jk)}$. In a projective normal scale at x , all such expressions vanish at x , and this proves the claim. $\square$

Remark 3.2. In the flat case, when $\lambda = 0$ and $\beta = 0$, (3.8) recovers the projectively invariant quantization map defined in equations 4.13 and 4.14 of [24]. See Section 4.1 below for further discussion.

The following proposition shows that the operators $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ arise naturally as a measure of how the invariant lift fails to preserve the symmetric product.

Proposition 3.3. *For $1 \leq q \leq p$ let $a_q \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_q})}[\lambda_q]$ for non-excluded weights λ_q such that for every $J \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, the sums $\sum_{q \in J} \lambda_j$ are also non-excluded. Write $K = \sum_{q=1}^p k_q$ and $\Lambda = \sum_{q=1}^p \lambda_q$. Then*

$$(3.9) \quad a_1 \odot \dots \odot a_p \stackrel{I_1 \dots I_K}{=} (\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p)^{I_1 \dots I_K} - \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s}}{(\Lambda + n + 2K - s)_{(s)}} \mathbb{X}^{(I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \mathcal{L}_{K-s}(\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_p)^{I_{s+1} \dots I_K}.$$

Proof. Suppose that there exist $u_r \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k-r})}[\lambda]$ such that

$$a_1 \odot \dots \odot a_p \stackrel{I_1 \dots I_K}{=} \tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p \stackrel{I_1 \dots I_K}{=} - \sum_{s=1}^K \mathbb{X}^{(I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \tilde{u}_s^{I_{s+1} \dots I_K}.$$

If $v^{I_1 \dots I_k} = \mathbb{X}^{(I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_s} \tilde{b}^{I_{s+1} \dots I_k)}$ for $b \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k-s})}[\lambda]$, then it can be checked that

$$\hat{\nabla}_P v^{I_1 \dots I_{k-1} P} = \frac{s(\lambda + n + 2k - s)}{k} \mathbb{X}^{(I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_{s-1}} \tilde{b}^{I_s \dots I_{k-1}}),$$

and applying this observation with $b = u_s$ and using the definition of $a_1 \odot \dots \odot a_p$ yields

$$(3.10) \quad \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_r} (\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p)^{I_1 \dots I_K} = \sum_{s=r}^K \frac{s_{(r)} (\Lambda + 2K + n - s)_{(r)}}{K_{(r)}} \mathbb{X}^{(I_1} \dots \mathbb{X}^{I_{s-r}} \tilde{u}_s^{I_{s-r+1} \dots I_{K-r}}).$$

The $s = r$ term of this sum and the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{K-r}$ yield

$$u_r^{i_1 \dots i_{K-r}} = \frac{\binom{K}{r}}{(\Lambda + 2K + n - r)_{(r)}} \mathcal{L}_{K-r}(a_1, \dots, a_p)^{i_1 \dots i_{K-r}},$$

and this proves the claim. $\square$

3.1. One-Dimensional Case. The one-dimensional case of Theorem 1.2 is more interesting than it may appear at first. With the canonical identification $\mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda] \simeq \mathcal{E}[\lambda + 2k]$, Proposition 2.1 implies that a section of $\mathcal{E}[\mu]$ admits an invariant lift to a symmetric k -tensor as long as μ is not in the set of excluded weights $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. For a non-negative integer k , $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} - \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, and $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma]$, define $\tilde{k}(u)$ to be the invariant lift of u viewed as a section of $\mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\sigma - 2k]$, so that

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} (-1)^k \binom{\sigma}{k} \tilde{k}(u) &= (-1)^k \binom{\sigma}{k} \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{(-1)^m \binom{k}{m}}{(\sigma)_{(m)}} \widetilde{D^m(u)} \hat{E}^{k-m} \odot \mathbb{X}^m \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k \binom{k-1-\sigma}{k-m} \frac{1}{m!} \widetilde{D^m(u)} \hat{E}^{k-m} \odot \mathbb{X}^m, \end{aligned}$$

Here D is the divergence operator determined by a representative of a flat projective structure in one-dimension, and E is a unimodular frame corresponding to a volume form made parallel by D . If $1 \leq m \leq p$, $\sigma_m \notin \{0, \dots, k_m - 1\}$, $K = \sum_{m=1}^p k_m$, and $\Sigma = \sum_{m=1}^p \sigma_m$, the operator $\mathcal{L}_\beta : \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda_1 + 2k_1] \times \dots \times \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda_p + 2k_p] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\Sigma + 2\beta]$ determines a multilinear pairing,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\beta^{k_1, \dots, k_p} : \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_1] \times \dots \times \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_p] &\rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\Sigma - 2(K - \beta)], & \text{defined by} \\ \mathcal{R}_\beta^{k_1, \dots, k_p}(u_1, \dots, u_p) &= \mathcal{L}_\beta(\tilde{k}_1(u_1), \dots, \tilde{k}_p(u_p)). \end{aligned}$$

Straightforward computations using (3.11) and $(\text{tr } \hat{\nabla})^l (\hat{E}^{k-p} \odot \mathbb{X}^p) = \frac{(p)_{(l)}(2k+1-p)_{(l)}}{k_{(l)}} \hat{E}^{k-p} \odot \mathbb{X}^{p-l}$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} &(-1)^K \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \binom{\sigma_i}{k_i} \right) \mathcal{R}_0^{k_1, \dots, k_p}(u_1, \dots, u_p) \\ &= (\text{tr } \hat{\nabla})^K \left\{ \sum_{m=0}^k \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \binom{k_i-1-\sigma_i}{k_i-m_i} \right) \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{D^{m_i}(u_i)}{m_i!} \hat{E}^{K-M} \odot \mathbb{X}^M \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{s=0}^M \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \frac{\binom{k_i-1-\sigma_i}{k_i-m_i}}{m_i!} \right) \binom{K}{s} (\text{tr})^K \left\{ \hat{\nabla}^{K-s} \left(\prod_{i=1}^p D^{m_i}(u_i) \right) \otimes \hat{\nabla}^s (\hat{E}^{K-M} \odot \mathbb{X}^M) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{s=0}^M \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \frac{\binom{k_i-1-\sigma_i}{k_i-m_i}}{m_i!} \right) \binom{M}{s} \binom{2K+1-M}{s} s! (\text{tr})^{K-s} \left\{ \hat{\nabla}^{K-s} \left(\prod_{i=1}^p D^{m_i}(u_i) \right) \otimes \hat{\nabla}^s (\hat{E}^{K-M} \odot \mathbb{X}^{M-s}) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{s=0}^M \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \binom{k_i-1-\sigma_i}{k_i-m_i} \right) \binom{M}{m_1; \dots; m_p} \binom{2K+1-M}{s} \binom{\Sigma-3K+M}{M-s} D^{K-M} \left(\prod_{i=1}^p D^{m_i}(u_i) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $M = \sum_{i=1}^p m_i$, $\binom{M}{m_1; \dots; m_p}$ is the standard multinomial coefficient, and $\sum_{m=0}^k$ is written sometimes for $\sum_{m_1=0}^{k_1} \dots \sum_{m_p=0}^{k_p}$. Simplifying yields

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} &(-1)^K \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \binom{\sigma_i}{k_i} \right) \mathcal{R}_0^{k_1, \dots, k_p}(u_1, \dots, u_p) \\ &= \sum_{m_1=0}^{k_1} \dots \sum_{m_p=0}^{k_p} \left(\prod_{i=1}^p \binom{k_i-1-\sigma_i}{k_i-m_i} \right) \binom{M}{m_1; \dots; m_p} \binom{\Sigma-K+1}{M} D^{K-M} \left(\prod_{i=1}^p D^{m_i}(u_i) \right), \end{aligned}$$

The given form of (3.12) is not satisfactory; it admits many simplifications and it is not clear which is the most useful. The identities $\binom{\sigma}{m} \binom{k-1-\sigma}{k-m} = (-1)^{k-m} \binom{\sigma}{m} \binom{\sigma-m}{k-m} = (-1)^{k-m} \binom{\sigma}{k} \binom{k}{m}$ suggest some manipulations.

Up to a normalizing constant, the **Rankin-Cohen brackets**, $\mathcal{R}_k : \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_1] \times \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_2] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - 2k]$, are defined (see Theorem 7.1 of [10] or eq. 3.1 of [11]) by

$$\mathcal{R}_k(u_1, u_2) = \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k-1-\sigma_2}{m} \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{k-m} D^m(u_1) D^{k-m}(u_2).$$

(The correspondence with usual notations is given by regarding a modular form of weight k as a section of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}[-k]$). The Rankin-Cohen brackets are graded skew-symmetric in the sense that $\mathcal{R}_k(u_2, u_1) = (-1)^k \mathcal{R}_k(u_1, u_2)$. The notation for $\mathcal{R}_k$ ought to include the weights σ_1 and σ_2 , e.g. $\mathcal{R}_{k, \sigma_1, \sigma_2}$, and that with such an extended notation skew-symmetry reads $\mathcal{R}_{k, \sigma_1, \sigma_2}(u_1, u_2) = (-1)^k \mathcal{R}_{k, \sigma_2, \sigma_1}(u_2, u_1)$.

Expanding (3.12) using the Leibniz rule and the identity $\sum_{s=0}^p \binom{a}{s} \binom{b}{p-s} = \binom{a+b}{p}$ shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^k \binom{\sigma_1}{k} \mathcal{R}_0^{k, 0, \dots, 0}(u_1, \dots, u_p) &= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{q=m}^k \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{k-m} \binom{\Sigma-k+1}{m} \binom{k-m}{q-m} D^q(u_1) D^{k-q} \left(\prod_{i=2}^p u_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^k \sum_{m=0}^q \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{k-m} \binom{\Sigma-k+1}{m} \binom{k-m}{q-m} D^q(u_1) D^{k-q} \left(\prod_{i=2}^p u_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^k \sum_{m=0}^q \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{k-q} \binom{\Sigma-k+1}{m} \binom{q-\sigma_1}{q-m} D^q(u_1) D^{k-q} \left(\prod_{i=2}^p u_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{q=0}^k (-1)^q \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{k-q} \binom{k-1-(\Sigma-\sigma_1)}{q} D^q(u_1) D^{k-q} \left(\prod_{i=2}^p u_i \right) = \mathcal{R}_k(u_1, \prod_{i=2}^p u_i). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mathcal{R}_k(u, v) = (-1)^k \binom{\sigma_1}{k} \mathcal{R}_0^{k, 0}(u, v)$. This is the sense in which the operators $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ generalize the Rankin-Cohen brackets.

Similarly, direct computation using (3.11) (or (3.8)) shows that if $\lambda + 2k \notin \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ then $\mathcal{L}_\beta : \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda + 2k] \times \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\lambda + \mu + 2\beta]$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(u, v) = \sum_{m=0}^{k-\beta} \frac{\binom{k-\beta-1-\mu}{m} \binom{k-\beta}{m}}{\binom{2k+\lambda}{m}} D^m(u) D^{k-\beta-m}(v) = \sum_{m=0}^{k-\beta} \frac{\binom{k-\beta-1-\mu}{m} \binom{k}{m} \binom{k-m}{\beta}}{\binom{2k+\lambda}{m} \binom{k}{\beta}} D^m(u) D^{k-\beta-m}(v),$$

which recovers a special case of equation 5.3 of Proposition 7 of [11]. The associated pairing, $\mathcal{R}_\beta^{k, 0} : \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_1] \times \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_2] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 - 2(k-\beta)]$, determined by $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ (and defined for $\sigma_i \notin \{0, \dots, k-1\}$)

is

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-1)^k \binom{\sigma_1}{k} \binom{k}{\beta} \mathcal{R}_\beta^{k,0}(u_1, u_2) \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{k-\beta} (-1)^m \binom{k-\beta-1-\sigma_2}{m} \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{k-m} \binom{k-m}{\beta} D^m(u_1) D^{k-\beta-m}(u_2) \\
&= \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{\beta} \sum_{m=0}^{k-\beta} (-1)^m \binom{k-\beta-1-\sigma_2}{m} \binom{k-\beta-1-\sigma_1}{k-\beta-m} D^m(u_1) D^{k-\beta-m}(u_2) \\
&= (-1)^{k-\beta} \binom{\sigma_1}{k-\beta} \binom{k-1-\sigma_1}{\beta} \mathcal{R}_0^{k-\beta,0}(u_1, u_2) = (-1)^k \binom{\sigma_1}{k} \binom{k}{\beta} \mathcal{R}_0^{k-\beta,0},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\mathcal{R}_\beta^{k,0} = \mathcal{R}_0^{k-\beta,0}$.

3.2. Another Definition of $\mathcal{L}_\beta$. For any smooth manifold, N , the action of $\text{Diff}(N)$ on T^*N is Hamiltonian with respect to the tautological Poisson structure, $\{, \}$. A moment map, $\Phi : \text{Vec}(N) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*N)$, for this action is defined as follows. Each vector field, $X \in \text{Vec}(N)$ has a tautological lift to a vector field $\bar{X} \in \text{Vec}(T^*N)$ which is the infinitesimal generator of the action on T^*N of the differential of the flow of X . The moment map, Φ , is defined by $\Phi(X) = \alpha(\bar{X})$, where α is the tautological one-form on T^*N . Φ extends to give the tautological algebra isomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{S}(N) \rightarrow \text{Pol}^b(T^*N)$, and this extension is $\text{Diff}(N)$ -equivariant in the sense that $\Phi(\mathfrak{L}_X a) = \mathfrak{L}_{\bar{X}} \Phi(a)$. Let $\mathbb{E}$ denote the Euler vector field generating the dilations in the fibers of T^*N . If ∇ is an affine connection on N , and if $a \in \Gamma(S^k(TN))$, denote by $\text{div}(a)$ the section of $S^k(TN)$ defined by $\nabla_p a^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p}$.

Lemma 3.1. *If N is a smooth manifold equipped with an affine connection, ∇ , there exists a unique linear second-order differential operator $D : C^\infty(T^*N) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*N)$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(3.13) \quad D(\Phi(a)) = k\Phi(\text{div}(a)), \quad \text{for all } a \in \Gamma(S^k(TN)).$$

Proof. If D' is a linear second-order differential operator satisfying the given conditions, then $E = D' - D$ is a linear differential operator of order at most 2 annihilating $\text{Pol}^b(T^*N)$. For $f \in C^\infty(N)$ and $a \in \Gamma(S^k(TN))$,

$$D(\Phi(fa)) = k\Phi(\text{div}(fa)) = k\Phi(f)\Phi(\text{div}(a)) + k\Phi(df(a)) = \Phi(f)D(\Phi(a)) + k\Phi(df(a)),$$

and so $E(\Phi(fa)) = \Phi(f)E(\Phi(a))$, so that the differential operator $\Phi^{-1} \circ E \circ \Phi$ is a $C^\infty(N)$ -module map from $\text{Pol}^b(T^*N) \rightarrow \text{Pol}^b(T^*N)$. Because this map vanishes on each graded piece $\Gamma(S^k(TN))$ it must be identically 0. A linear second order differential operator annihilating $\text{Pol}^b(T^*N)$ must vanish on $C^\infty(T^*N)$, and so $E = 0$. This shows uniqueness.

If x^i are local coordinates on N , let z_i denote the natural coordinates on the fiber T_x^*N (so that $\alpha = z_i dx^i$ and $\mathbb{E} = z_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$), and let $\Gamma_{ij}{}^k$ denote the Christoffel symbols of ∇ with respect to the coordinate frame $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}$. Keeping in mind that the components, $\Gamma_{ij}{}^k$, do not transform tensorially, it is straightforward to check that $D = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial x^i} + z_k \Gamma_{ij}{}^k \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} + \Gamma_{ip}{}^p \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$ does not depend on the choice of coordinates and is a differential operator satisfying the given conditions. $\square$

Note that the operator D of Lemma 3.1 has homogeneity -1 in the sense that $[\mathfrak{L}_{\mathbb{E}}, D] = -D$.

Applying Lemma 3.1 to the ambient connection, $\hat{\nabla}$, yields a second order differential operator $\hat{D} : C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{L}) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*\mathbb{L})$, and an algebra isomorphism $\hat{\Phi} : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{L}) \rightarrow \text{Pol}^b(T^*\mathbb{L})$ (ordinarily in this

paper the notation for the isomorphism $\hat{\Phi}$ has been suppressed). The operators $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ may be defined in terms of $\hat{D}$ by

$$K_{(K-\beta)}\mathcal{L}_\beta(\widetilde{a_1, \dots, a_p}) = \hat{\Phi}^{-1}(\hat{D}^{K-\beta}(\hat{\Phi}(\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p))) \mod \mathbb{X}.$$

The entire function $\sigma(z) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-z)} = \sum_{m \geq 0} c_m z^m$ has zeros only at the postive integers. To the differential operator, $z \frac{d}{dz}$, on the line, associate the formal pseudo-differential operator $\sigma(z \frac{d}{dz}) = \sum_{m \geq 0} c_m (z \frac{d}{dz})^m$ and observe that $\sigma(z \frac{d}{dz})(z^k) = \sigma(k)z^k = 0$ for k a positive integer and that $\sigma(z \frac{d}{dz})(1) = c_0 = \sigma(0) = 1$. Consequently, it makes sense to apply $\sigma(z \frac{d}{dz})$ to any function analytic and entire in z , and the result is the zeroth term in the series expansion of the function. Define $\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{1}{m!} \sigma(z \frac{d}{dz}) \circ (\frac{d}{dz})^m$. If f is any entire function, $\mathcal{Q}(f)$ is defined and equals $f(1)$. In particular, $\mathcal{Q}(z^k) = 1$ for every non-negative integer k .

Now let $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ denote the Euler vector field generating the dilations in the fibers of $T^*\mathbb{L}$. Define a formal pseudo-differential operator $\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{1}{m!} \sigma(\mathfrak{L}_{\hat{\mathbb{E}}}) \circ \hat{D}^m$. Reasoning as in the one-dimensional case shows that, for $A \in S^k(T\mathbb{L})$,

$$\mathcal{Q}(\hat{\Phi}(A)) = \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{1}{m!} \sigma(\mathfrak{L}_{\hat{\mathbb{E}}}) \circ \hat{D}^m(\hat{\Phi}(A)) = \sum_{m=0}^k \frac{\sigma(k-m)}{m!} \hat{D}^m(\hat{\Phi}(A)) = \frac{1}{k!} \hat{D}^k(\hat{\Phi}(A)).$$

It follows that for $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_{k_i}$

$$\mathcal{Q}(\hat{\Phi}(\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p)) = \frac{1}{K!} \hat{D}^K(\hat{\Phi}(\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p)) = \hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{L}_0(\widetilde{a_1, \dots, a_p})).$$

Alternatively, one can write

$$\mathcal{L}_0(\widetilde{a_1, \dots, a_p}) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \hat{\Phi}^{-1} \circ \sigma(\mathfrak{L}_{\hat{\mathbb{E}}}) \circ \hat{\Phi} \circ (\text{div})^m(\tilde{a}_1 \odot \dots \odot \tilde{a}_p).$$

4. STAR PRODUCTS

4.1. Projectively Invariant Deformation Quantization. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^k \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}$ be as in the introduction. For $\lambda \notin \{-n, -n-1, -n-2, \dots\}$ and $\mu \notin \{-1, -2, \dots\}$ define the **projectively invariant quantization map** $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}$ by setting $\mathcal{L}(a)(u) = \mathcal{L}_0(a, u)$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\lambda, k}$ and $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$, and extending linearly to $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$. To any $A \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ there corresponds an integer $k \geq 0$, and a sequence of $a_\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\lambda, k}$ for $1 \leq \gamma \leq k$, such that $A = \sum_{\gamma=0}^k a_\gamma$ and hence an $\mathcal{L}(A) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^k$ defined by $\mathcal{L}(A) = \sum_{\gamma=0}^k \mathcal{L}(a_\gamma)$. Because the principal symbol of $\mathcal{L}(A)$ is the top order piece of A , $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}$ is an injective map. The principal symbol of $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^k$ is some $a_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\lambda, k}$, and so $\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{L}(a_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^{k-1}$ is a differential operator of order at most $k-1$. The principal symbol of $\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{L}(a_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^{k-1}$ is some $a_{k-1} \in \mathcal{A}_{\lambda, k-1}$, and so $\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{L}(a_k) - \mathcal{L}(a_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^{k-2}$. Iterating this procedure yields, for $0 \leq \gamma \leq k$, a sequence of $a_\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{\lambda, k-\gamma}$ (some of which may be 0), so that $\mathcal{D} = \sum_{\gamma=0}^k \mathcal{L}(a_\gamma) = \mathcal{L}(A)$, where $A = \sum_{\gamma=0}^k a_\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_\lambda$. This shows that $\mathcal{L}$ is onto and admits a linear inverse, $\mathcal{L}^{-1} : \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}^k \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\lambda$, which should be called a **projectively invariant symbol map**, as in the projectively flat case.

As explained in Remark 3.2 equation (3.8) shows that $\mathcal{L}$ is the projectively invariant quantization map defined in the flat case by Lecomte-Ovsienko, [24]. Moreover, Proposition 3.2 shows that if $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ is the representative associated to a choice of projective normal scale at $x \in M$, then $\mathcal{L}(a)$ satisfies equation (3.8) (with $\beta = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$) at the point x .

4.2. Self-Adjointness of Quantization Map and Half-Densities. On the space, $\mathcal{E}_c[\mu]$, of compactly supported sections of $\mathcal{E}[\mu]$, there is canonical pairing, $(,) : \mathcal{E}_c[\mu] \times \mathcal{E}_c[-n-1-\mu] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by integration, $(u, v) = \int_M uv$. The specialization to the flat case of the following proposition was shown in [15] by invoking uniqueness of the flat projectively invariant quantization map.

Theorem 4.1. *If $a^{i_1 \dots i_k} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$ then $\mathcal{L}(a)$ is self-adjoint in the sense that $(\mathcal{L}(a)(u), v) = (-1)^k (u, \mathcal{L}(a)(v))$ for $u \in \mathcal{E}_c[\mu]$ and $v \in \mathcal{E}_c[-n-1-\mu]$.*

Proof. First let $g \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[-n-1]$, so that $\int_M g$ is defined. Let $s : U \subset M \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$ be any choice of projective scale on the open domain U . It is claimed that $\int_U g = \int_{s(U)} \tilde{g} \alpha$, where α is the tautological n -form on $\mathbb{L}$. Because α has homogeneity $n+1$, the n -form $\tilde{g} \alpha$ has homogeneity 0, and so replacing s in the integral by $\tilde{s} = fs$ does not change the value of the integral. The restriction to U of g equals hs^{n+1} for some $h \in C^\infty(U)$, and by definition there hold $s^*(\tilde{g}) = h$ and $s^*(\alpha) = s^{n+1}$, so that $\int_U g = \int_U hs^{n+1} = \int_{s(U)} \tilde{g} \alpha$.

If $A \in \text{Vec}(\mathbb{L})$ has homogeneity $-n-1$, then $\text{div}_\Psi(A)$ is a function on $\mathbb{L}$ of homogeneity $-n-1$, and so (abusing notation slightly), it makes sense to write $\int_M \text{div}_\Psi(A)$ to denote the integral of the corresponding n -form on M . It is claimed that $\int_M \text{div}_\Psi(A) = 0$. First it is shown that for $A \in \text{Vec}(\mathbb{L})$ of homogeneity λ ,

$$(4.1) \quad (n+1)\text{div}_\Psi(A)\alpha = (n+1+\lambda)i(A)\Psi - \lambda d(i(A)\alpha).$$

By definition $\text{div}_\Psi(A)\Psi = \mathfrak{L}_A(\Psi) = \mathfrak{L}_A(d\alpha) = d(\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha)$. Interior multiplying $\mathbb{X}$ gives

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (n+1)\text{div}_\Psi(A)\alpha &= i(\mathbb{X})d(\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha) = \mathfrak{L}_\mathbb{X}(\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha) - d(i(\mathbb{X})\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha) \\ &= (n+1+\lambda)\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha - d(i(\mathbb{X})\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} i(\mathbb{X})\mathfrak{L}_A\alpha &= i(\mathbb{X})(i(A)d\alpha + d(i(A)\alpha)) = -i(A)(i(\mathbb{X})d\alpha) + \mathfrak{L}_\mathbb{X}(i(A)\alpha) - d(i(\mathbb{X})(i(A)\alpha)) \\ &= -(n+1)i(A)\alpha + (n+1+\lambda)i(A)\alpha = \lambda i(A)\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and in (4.2) this gives (4.1). In particular, in the case that $\lambda = -n-1$ there holds $\text{div}_\Psi(A)\alpha = d(i(A)\alpha)$. Choose a locally finite open cover, $\{U_\beta\}$, of M , a subordinate partition of unity, $\{\phi_\beta\}$, and on each U_β a local section $s_\beta : U_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{L}$. Then Stokes's Theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \text{div}_\Psi(A) &= \sum_\beta \int_{U_\beta} \phi_\beta \text{div}_\Psi(A) = \sum_\beta \int_{s_\beta(U_\beta)} (\phi_\beta \circ \rho) \text{div}_\Psi(A) = \sum_\beta \int_{s_\beta(U_\beta)} (\phi_\beta \circ \rho) d(i(A)\alpha) \\ &= \sum_\beta \int_{s_\beta(U_\beta)} d((\phi_\beta \circ \rho)i(A)\alpha) - \sum_\beta \int_{s_\beta(U_\beta)} d(\phi_\beta \circ \rho) \wedge i(A)\alpha = - \sum_\beta \int_{s_\beta(U_\beta)} d(\phi_\beta \circ \rho) \wedge i(A)\alpha \\ &= - \sum_\beta \int_{U_\beta} d\phi_\beta \wedge s_\beta^*(i(A)\alpha) = - \int_M d(\sum_\beta \phi_\beta) \wedge s_\beta^*(i(A)\alpha) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

so that $\int_M \text{div}_\Psi(A) = 0$.

The proposition will be proved now by an integration by parts argument which uses the preceeding observation. For $0 \leq s \leq k-1$, define vector fields B_s^I of homogeneity $-n-1$ by

$$B_s^I = \tilde{a}^{I I_1 \dots I_{k-1}} (\hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_s} \tilde{v}) (\hat{\nabla}_{I_{s+1}} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k-1}} \tilde{u}).$$

Note that because $\hat{\nabla}\Psi = 0$ there holds $\operatorname{div}_\Psi(B) = \hat{\nabla}_I B^I$ for any $B \in \operatorname{Vec}(\mathbb{L})$. Repeatedly using together the Leibniz rule and $\operatorname{tr} \hat{\nabla} \tilde{a} = 0$ yields

$$(4.3) \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{L}(a)(u)\tilde{v}} = (-1)^k \widetilde{\mathcal{L}(a)(v)\tilde{u}} + \sum_{s=0}^{k-1} (-1)^s \operatorname{div}_\Psi(B_s)$$

Since the B_s have homogeneity $-n-1$ integrating over M the $-(n+1)$ -densities corresponding to (4.3) yields $(\mathcal{L}(a)(u), v) = (-1)^k (u, \mathcal{L}(a)(v))$. $\square$

Theorem 4.1 shows that the representation of $\mathcal{A}$ as operators on the space of **half-densities** (sections of $\mathcal{E}[-(n+1)/2]$) is formally self-adjoint.

4.3. Projectively Invariant Star Product. On a smooth manifold, N , restricting to $\operatorname{Pol}^b(T^*N)$ the tautological Poisson bracket on $C^\infty(T^*N)$ and using the identification of $\operatorname{Pol}^b(T^*N)$ with the algebra of symmetric tensors, $\mathcal{S}(N)$, yields the symmetric Schouten bracket, $\{, \} : \mathcal{S}(N) \times \mathcal{S}(N) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(N)$. If ∇ is any torsion-free affine connection on N set

$$(4.4) \quad \{A, B\}^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1}} = k A^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \nabla_p B^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1})} - l B^{p(i_1 \dots i_{l-1}} \nabla_p A^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1})}.$$

Using the identity

$$(4.5) \quad A^{(p i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} B^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1})} = \frac{k}{k+l} A^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} B^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1})} + \frac{l}{k+l} B^{p(i_1 \dots i_{l-1}} A^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1})},$$

it is easy to check directly the Leibniz rule, $\{A \odot B, C\} = A \odot \{B, C\} + B \odot \{A, C\}$. It is straightforward to check directly that for $A, B, C \in \operatorname{Vec}(N)$, there holds $\operatorname{Cycle}\{\{A, B\}, C\} = 0$, and from this and the Leibniz rule it follows straightforwardly that for any $A, B, C \in \mathcal{S}(N)$ there holds $\operatorname{Cycle}\{\{A, B\}, C\} = 0$, so that $\{, \}$ is a Poisson structure on $\mathcal{S}(N)$. By virtue of the Leibniz rule, the Poisson structure $\{, \}$ is completely determined by its action on vector fields. If ∇' is a second torsion-free affine-connection, and $\{, \}'$ is the Poisson structure determined by ∇' according to (4.4), then it is easy to check that for vector fields A and B , $\{A, B\}' = \{A, B\}$, from which it follows that the Poisson structures are the same, and therefore independent of the choice of torsion-free affine connection. Using this independence in a local coordinate chart it is easy to check that $\{, \}$ is simply the restriction of the tautological Poisson bracket on $C^\infty(T^*N)$. The preceding shows that (4.4) gives a coordinate free way of computing this bracket, and this formulation will be used repeatedly in what follows.

Each projective structure, $[\nabla]$, determines a projectively invariant, skew-symmetric, differential, bilinear pairing $\langle, \rangle : \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1})}[\lambda_1] \times \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_2})}[\lambda_2] \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1+k_2-1})}[\lambda_1 + \lambda_2]$ defined by

$$\langle \widetilde{a, b} \rangle^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1}} = \{\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}\}^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1}}.$$

This means that $(\langle \widetilde{a, b} \rangle - \{\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}\}) \wedge \mathbb{X} = 0$.

Example 4.1. If λ_1, λ_2 are non-excluded weights, for $a \in \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_1})}[\lambda_1]$ and $b^i \in \mathcal{E}^i[\lambda_2]$, there hold

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle a, b \rangle^i &= a^p \nabla_p b^i - b^p \nabla_p a^i + \frac{\lambda_1}{(n+1+\lambda_2)} a^i \nabla_p b^p - \frac{\lambda_2}{(n+1+\lambda_1)} b^i \nabla_p a^p \\ \langle a, b \rangle^{ij} &= 2a^{p(i} \nabla_p b^{j)} - b^p \nabla_p a^{ij} + \frac{\lambda_1}{(\lambda_2+n+1)} a^{ij} \nabla_p b^p - \frac{2\lambda_2}{(\lambda_1+n+3)} b^{(i} \nabla_p a^{j)p}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\lambda_1 = 0 = \lambda_2$ then (4.6) shows that on vector fields the pairing $\langle, \rangle$ is the usual Schouten bracket, and so in this case $\langle, \rangle = \{, \}$, and in this case the notation $\{, \}$ will be used instead of $\langle, \rangle$.

Lemma 4.1. *If λ_γ are non-excluded weights and $a_\gamma \in \mathcal{E}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_i})}[\lambda_\gamma]$ then*

$$\langle a_1 \odot a_2, a_3 \rangle - a_1 \odot \langle a_2, a_3 \rangle - a_2 \odot \langle a_1, a_3 \rangle = \frac{\lambda_3(k_1+k_2)}{(\lambda_1+\lambda_2+n+2(k_1+k_2)-1)} a_3 \odot \mathcal{L}_{k_1+k_2-1}(a_1, a_2).$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.3 and the fact that $\{, \}$ is a Poisson bracket on $T^*\mathbb{L}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \widetilde{a_1 \odot a_2}, \tilde{a}_3 \} - \tilde{a}_1 \odot \{ \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{a}_3 \} - \tilde{a}_2 \odot \{ \tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_3 \} \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{k_1+k_2} \frac{\binom{k_1+k_2}{s}}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + n + 2(k_1 + k_2) - s)_{(s)}} \{ \mathbb{X} \odot \cdots \odot \mathbb{X} \odot \mathcal{L}_{k_1+k_2-s}(\widetilde{a_1, a_2}), \tilde{a}_3 \}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the claim it suffices to examine the $s = 1$ term. Because $\{, \}$ is a Poisson bracket,

$$\{ \mathbb{X} \odot \mathcal{L}_{k_1+k_2-1}(\widetilde{a_1, a_2}), \tilde{a}_3 \} = \mathbb{X} \odot \{ \mathcal{L}_{k_1+k_2-1}(\widetilde{a_1, a_2}), \tilde{a}_3 \} + \mathcal{L}_{k_1+k_2-1}(\widetilde{a_1, a_2}) \odot \{ \mathbb{X}, \tilde{a}_3 \}$$

and the term $\{ \mathbb{X}, \tilde{a}_3 \} = \lambda_3 \tilde{a}_3$, and from this the claim follows. $\square$

The notation $O(m, f)$ (resp. $O(m, \tilde{f})$) is a shorthand for the phrase ‘terms of order at most m in f (resp. $\tilde{f}$)’

Proposition 4.1. *If λ_1 and λ_2 are not excluded weights and $a_p^{i_1 \dots i_{k_p}} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_p})}[\lambda_p]$ for $p = 1, 2$, then for any μ , $[\mathcal{L}(a_1), \mathcal{L}(a_2)] - \mathcal{L}(\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \mu+\Lambda}^{K-2}$.*

Proof. By definition $\mathcal{L}_0(\widetilde{a_1, f}) = \tilde{a}_1^{I_1 \dots I_k} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1 \dots I_k} \tilde{f}$. Using the fact that $\hat{\nabla}_{[I} \hat{\nabla}_{J]}$ is a curvature term (so of 0th order),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(a_2, \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a_1, f)}) &= \tilde{a}_2^{I_{k_1+1} \dots I_K} \tilde{a}_1^{I_1 \dots I_{k_1}} \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k_1+1}} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_K} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k_1}} \tilde{f} \\ &+ k_2 \tilde{a}_2^{II_{k_1+1} \dots I_{K-1}} \hat{\nabla}_I \tilde{a}_1^{I_1 \dots I_{k_1}} \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k_1+1}} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{K-1}} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k_1}} \tilde{f} + O(K-2, \tilde{f}) \\ &= \tilde{a}_1^{(I_1 \dots I_{k_1}} \tilde{a}_2^{I_{k_1+1} \dots I_K)} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_K} \tilde{f} \\ &+ k_2 \tilde{a}_2^{I(I_{k_1+1} \dots I_{K-1}} \hat{\nabla}_I \tilde{a}_1^{I_1 \dots I_{k_1}}) \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{K-1}} \tilde{f} + O(K-2, \tilde{f}), \end{aligned}$$

and from this there follows

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{L}(a_1), \widetilde{\mathcal{L}(a_2)}](f) &= \{ \tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2 \}^{I_1 \dots I_{K-1}} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{K-1}} \tilde{f} + O(K-2, \tilde{f}) \\ &= \langle \widetilde{a_1, a_2} \rangle^{I_1 \dots I_{K-1}} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{K-1}} \tilde{f} + O(K-2, \tilde{f}) = \mathcal{L}(\langle \widetilde{a_1, a_2} \rangle)(f) + O(K-2, \tilde{f}), \end{aligned}$$

and from this the claim follows. $\square$

Formally extend the quantization map, $\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\lambda, \mu}$, to the algebra $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ by defining $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a) = \epsilon^k \mathcal{L}(a)$ for $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$. For weights λ and μ which are not excluded, define $\epsilon \star_{\lambda, \sigma}^\mu : \mathcal{A}_\lambda \times \mathcal{A}_\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\lambda+\sigma}$ by $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(A \epsilon \star_{\lambda, \sigma}^\mu B) = \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(A) \circ \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(B)$ and extend by linearity to $\mathcal{A}_\lambda[[\epsilon]]$. By definition the product $\epsilon \star_{\lambda, \sigma}^\mu$ is associative in the sense that

$$a \epsilon \star_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 + \lambda_3}^\mu (b \epsilon \star_{\lambda_2, \lambda_3}^\mu c) = (a \epsilon \star_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^\mu c) \epsilon \star_{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2, \lambda_3}^\mu c.$$

In particular, when $\lambda = \sigma = 0$, this product makes $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$ into an associative algebra; in this case the product will be denoted by $\epsilon \star^\mu$. In the particularly interesting case $\mu = -(n+1)/2$, $\epsilon \star^{-(n+1)/2}$ will be written simply $\epsilon \star$. Specializing $\epsilon = 1$ gives an associative multiplication, $\star$, on $\mathcal{A}$. Denote the symmetric product of operators by $\odot$, so that $\mathcal{L}(a) \odot \mathcal{L}(b) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b) + \mathcal{L}(b) \circ \mathcal{L}(a))$.

Theorem 4.2. *For $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$, $b \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_l)}$, and any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{L}(a) \odot \mathcal{L}(b) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) - \frac{(n+1+2\mu)(k+l)}{2(n+2(k+l)-1)} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{k+l-1}(a, b)) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, 0}^{k+l-2},$$

and, as a consequence,

$$(4.8) \quad a \star^\mu b = a \odot b + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\{a, b\} + \frac{(n+1+2\mu)(k+l)}{(n+2(k+l)-1)} \mathcal{L}_{k+l-1}(a, b) \right) + O(\epsilon^2),$$

$$(4.9) \quad a \star^\mu b - b \star^\mu a = \epsilon \{a, b\} + O(\epsilon^2).$$

In particular, when $\mu = -\frac{(n+1)}{2}$,

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{L}(a) \odot \mathcal{L}(b) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) \in \mathcal{D}_{-(n+1)/2, 0}^{k+l-2}, \quad a \star b = a \odot b + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \{a, b\} + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Proof. To begin with assume $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}[\lambda]$, $b \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_l)}[\sigma]$, $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$, with λ , σ , and μ arbitrary (non-excluded) weights. The computations are involved, and it is easier to avoid mistakes if one does not specialize until the end to the particular weights appearing in the statement of the theorem.

The following identity will be used constantly, often without comment:

$$(4.11) \quad C^{I_1 \dots I_s} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_s} \tilde{f} = C^{(I_1 \dots I_s)} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_s} \tilde{f} + O(s-2, \tilde{f}).$$

This follows from the fact that $\hat{\nabla}_{[I} \hat{\nabla}_{J]}$ is zeroth order. Likewise there follows from the proof of Proposition 3.1 the following, to be used frequently:

$$(4.12) \quad \hat{\nabla}_{i_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{i_s} \tilde{f} = \widetilde{\nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_s} f} + O(s-2, f).$$

By definition, (4.11), (4.12), and (3.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(\widetilde{a \odot b}, f) &= \widetilde{a \odot b}^{I_1 \dots I_{k+l}} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+l}} \tilde{f} \\ &= \widetilde{a \odot b}^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l}} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l}} f \\ &\quad + (k+l)(\mu - (k+l-1)) \widetilde{a \odot b}^{\infty i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1}} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f + O(k+l-2, f) \end{aligned}$$

By definition of the invariant lift,

$$\widetilde{a \odot b}^{\infty i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1}} = -\frac{1}{(\lambda + \sigma + n + 2(k+l) - 1)} \nabla_p (\widetilde{a \odot b})^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1} p},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(a \odot b, f) &= (a \odot b)^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l}} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l}} f \\ &\quad + \frac{(k+l)(k+l-1-\mu)}{(\lambda + \sigma + n + 2(k+l) - 1)} (\nabla_p (a \odot b)^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f + O(k+l-2, f) \end{aligned}$$

Now note that

$$a^{(i_1 \dots i_k} \nabla_p b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) = \frac{l}{k+l} a^{(i_1 \dots i_k} \nabla_p b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) + \frac{k}{k+l} a^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \nabla_p b^{i_k \dots i_{k+l})},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_p (a \odot b)^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l-1} p} &= a^{(i_1 \dots i_k} \nabla_p b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) + b^{(i_1 \dots i_l} \nabla_p a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) \\ &= \frac{l}{k+l} a^{(i_1 \dots i_k} \nabla_p b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) + \frac{k}{k+l} a^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \nabla_p b^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) \\ &\quad + \frac{k}{k+l} b^{(i_1 \dots i_l} \nabla_p a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}) + \frac{l}{k+l} b^{p(i_1 \dots i_{l-1}} \nabla_p a^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1} p}), \end{aligned}$$

from which follows

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.13) \quad \mathcal{L}_0(a \odot b, f) &= (a \odot b)^{i_1 \dots i_{k+l}} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l}} f \\
&+ \frac{l(k+l-1-\mu)}{(\lambda+\sigma+n+2(k+l)-1)} \left(a^{(i_1 \dots i_k \nabla_p b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}})^p} + b^{p(i_1 \dots i_{l-1} \nabla_p a^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1}})} \right) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\
&+ \frac{k(k+l-1-\mu)}{(\lambda+\sigma+n+2(k+l)-1)} \left(a^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1} \nabla_p b^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}})} + b^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}})^p} \right) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\
&+ O(k+l-2, f)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the specialization $\lambda = 0 = \sigma$ and $\mu = -(n+1)/2$ gives $\frac{(k+l-1-\mu)}{(\lambda+\sigma+n+2(k+l)-1)} = 1/2$. This completes the computation of the top order terms of $\mathcal{L}_0(a \odot b, f)$. Now consider the top order terms of $\mathcal{L}_0(a, \mathcal{L}_0(b, f))$. Using (4.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_0(a, \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(b, f)}) &= \tilde{a}^{(I_1 \dots I_k \tilde{b}^{I_{k+1} \dots I_{k+l}})} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+l}} \tilde{f} \\
&+ k \tilde{a}^{Q I_1 \dots I_{k-1}} (\hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{b}^{I_k \dots I_{k+l-1}}) \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+l-1}} \tilde{f} + O(k+l-2, \tilde{f}).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{a}^{(\infty i_1 \dots i_{k-1} \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}})} &= \frac{k}{k+l} \tilde{a}^{\infty(i_1 \dots i_{k-1} \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}})} + \frac{l}{k+l} \tilde{b}^{\infty(i_1 \dots i_{l-1} \tilde{a}^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1}})} \\
&= -\frac{k}{(k+l)(\lambda+n+2k-1)} b^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p \widetilde{a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}}})^p} - \frac{l}{(k+l)(\sigma+n+2l-1)} a^{(i_1 \dots i_k \nabla_p \widetilde{b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}}})^p}.
\end{aligned}$$

With (4.12) and (3.3), this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.14) \quad \tilde{a}^{(I_1 \dots I_k \tilde{b}^{I_{k+1} \dots I_{k+l}})} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+l}} \tilde{f} &= a^{(i_1 \dots i_k \widetilde{b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l}}})} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l}} f \\
&+ \frac{k(k+l-1-\mu)}{(\lambda+n+2k-1)} b^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p \widetilde{a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}}})^p} \\
&+ \frac{l(k+l-1-\mu)}{(\sigma+n+2l-1)} a^{(i_1 \dots i_k \nabla_p \widetilde{b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}}})^p} + O(k+l-2, f).
\end{aligned}$$

Next are analyzed the contributions of the term $k \tilde{a}^{Q I_1 \dots I_{k-1}} (\hat{\nabla}_Q \tilde{b}^{I_k \dots I_{k+l-1}}) \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_{k+l-1}} \tilde{f}$, which equals

$$k \left(\tilde{a}^{q i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \hat{\nabla}_q \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}} + \tilde{a}^{\infty i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \hat{\nabla}_\infty \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}} \right) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f + O(k+l-2, f).$$

Using (2.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.15) \quad &(\tilde{a}^{q i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \hat{\nabla}_q \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}}) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f = \\
&(a^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1} \nabla_b \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}})} - \frac{l}{(\sigma+n+2l-1)} a^{(i_1 \dots i_k \nabla_p \widetilde{b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}}})^p}) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f + O(k+l-2, f).
\end{aligned}$$

Using (2.4) and (2.6) gives

$$k \tilde{a}^{\infty i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \hat{\nabla}_\infty \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}} = -\frac{k(l+\sigma)}{(\lambda+n+2k-1)} b^{i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1} p}},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.16) \quad &k \tilde{a}^{\infty i_1 \dots i_{k-1}} \hat{\nabla}_\infty \tilde{b}^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\
&= -\frac{k(l+\sigma)}{(\lambda+n+2k-1)} b^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p \widetilde{a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}}})^p} \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f + O(k+l-2, f).
\end{aligned}$$

Adding (4.14), (4.15), and (4.16) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_0(a, \mathcal{L}_0(b, f)) &= a^{(i_1 \dots i_k b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l}}) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l}} f \\ &+ \frac{k(k-1-\mu-\sigma)}{(\lambda+n+2k-1)} b^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}})^p \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\ &+ \frac{l(l-1-\mu)}{(\sigma+n+2l-1)} a^{(i_1 \dots i_k \nabla_p b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}})^p \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\ &+ k a^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1} \nabla_p b^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}}) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f + O(k-l-2, f).\end{aligned}$$

Now symmetrizing yields

$$\begin{aligned}(4.17) \quad \mathcal{L}(a) \odot \mathcal{L}(b)(f) &- a^{(i_1 \dots i_k b^{i_{k+1} \dots i_{k+l}}) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l}} f \\ &= \left(\frac{l}{2} \frac{(2l-2-2\mu-\lambda)}{(\sigma+n+2k-1)} a^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p b^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}})^p + \frac{l}{2} b^{p(i_1 \dots i_{l-1} \nabla_p a^{i_l \dots i_{k+l-1}})} \right) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\ &+ \left(\frac{k}{2} \frac{(2k-2-2\mu-\sigma)}{(\lambda+n+2k-1)} b^{(i_1 \dots i_l \nabla_p a^{i_{l+1} \dots i_{k+l-1}})^p + \frac{k}{2} a^{p(i_1 \dots i_{k-1} \nabla_p b^{i_k \dots i_{k+l-1}})} \right) \nabla_{i_1} \dots \nabla_{i_{k+l-1}} f \\ &+ O(k+l-2, f).\end{aligned}$$

Together with the specialization $\lambda = 0 = \sigma$, (3.4), (4.13), and (4.17) give (4.7). With Proposition 4.1, (4.7) implies (4.8) and (4.9). $\square$

Corollary 4.1 (Corollary of Theorem 4.2). *The multiplication $\epsilon \star^\mu$ is a graded differential star product on $\mathcal{A}$ adapted to the tautological Poisson structure on $\mathcal{A}$ and having the form (1.2).*

Proof. By Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 4.1,

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(\{a, b\}) - \frac{(k+l)(n+1+2\mu)}{2(n+2(k+l)-1)} \mathcal{L}_{k+l-1}(a, b)$$

is a differential operator of order at most $k+l-2$. Define $B_2(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k+l-2})}$ to be its principal symbol. Then $\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{L}(B_2(a, b))$ is a differential operator of order at most $k+l-3$, and let $B_3(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k+l-3})}$ be its principal symbol. Proceeding in this way shows that there are $B_r(a, b) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k+l-r})}$ such that $\mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) = \sum_{r=1}^{k+l} \mathcal{L}(B_r(a, b))$. The tensors $B_r(a, b)$ are evidently bilinear differential operators in a and b . Since the differential operators involved in defining the B_r are all projectively invariant, the operators B_r will be also. From the definition of $\mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b)$ it is straightforward to see that $B_r(a, b)$ has order at most r in each of a and b . That $\epsilon \star^\mu$ satisfies (1.1) now follows by a formal calculation. That the constant function 1 is a unit for $\epsilon \star^\mu$ is immediate. By (4.9) the Lie bracket of $\epsilon \star^\mu$ agrees with the usual Poisson structure on $\mathcal{A}$ to first order.

By (4.8) of Theorem 4.2 the Hochschild 2-cochain of $\mathcal{A}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{A}$ defined on $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ by $H(a, b) = \frac{k+l}{n+2(k+l)-1} \mathcal{L}_{k+l-1}(a, b)$ must be a coboundary. If a Hochschild 1-cochain, C_1 , is defined on $\mathcal{A}_k$ by $C_1(a) = \frac{k}{n+2k-1} \nabla_p a^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p}$, then it is easy to check that $\partial C_1(a, b) = a \odot C_1(b) - C_1(a \odot b) + C_1(a) \odot b = H$. Note that choosing a different representative of $[\nabla]$ only adds to C_1 a 1-cocycle of the form $a^{i_1 \dots i_k} \rightarrow k \gamma_p a^{i_1 \dots i_{k-1} p}$, so that ∂C_1 is uniquely defined. The cochain C_1 can be written as a formal pseudo-differential operator on $\mathcal{A}$ as follows. Let D be the divergence operator on T^*M associated to the representative $\nabla \in [\nabla]$ as in Lemma 3.1. Then $C_1 = \frac{1}{n+1+2\mathfrak{L}_\mathbb{E}} \circ D$, where $\mathbb{E}$ is the Euler vector field on T^*M , and $\frac{1}{n+1+2\mathfrak{L}_\mathbb{E}}$ is interpreted as a formal power series in $\mathfrak{L}_\mathbb{E}$. Changing the choice of representative of $[\nabla]$ only perturbs C_1 by adding a 1-cocycle, and so ∂C_1 is well-defined, and evidently a formal bilinear pseudo-differential operator. $\square$

It follows also that the star product $A \epsilon \bar{\star} B = T(T^{-1}(A) \epsilon \star^\mu T^{-1}(B))$ gauge-equivalent to $\epsilon \star^\mu$ by the change of gauge $T = Id + \epsilon \frac{(n+1+2\mu)}{2} C_1$ satisfies $B_1 = \frac{1}{2} \{, \}$.

(4.24) and (4.23) suggest that in general $B_r^\mu(a, b)$ should be expressible in terms of sums of iterated expressions composed of $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ and $\{, \}$.

Proposition 4.2. *Writing $\bar{\epsilon} = -\epsilon$, there holds for $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$ and $b \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_l)}$,*

$$(4.18) \quad a \epsilon^\star^\mu b = b \bar{\epsilon}^\star^{-\mu-n-1} a.$$

In particular the star product $\epsilon^\star$ is symmetric.

Proof. Let $u \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_c[\mu]$ and $v \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}_c[-\mu - n - 1]$. Write $a \epsilon^\star^\mu b = \sum_{r=0}^{k+l} \epsilon^r B_r^\mu(a, b)$ and $a \bar{\epsilon}^\star^{-\mu-n-1} b = \sum_{r=0}^{k+l} \bar{\epsilon}^r B_r^{-\mu-n-1}(a, b)$. The claim amounts to showing $B_r^\mu(a, b) = (-1)^r B_r^{-\mu-n-1}(b, a)$, and so when $\mu = -(n+1)/2$ shows the symmetry of $\epsilon^\star$. Now $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a \epsilon^\star^\mu b) = \epsilon^{k+l} \sum_{r=0}^{k+l} (-1)^r \mathcal{L}(B_r^\mu(a, b))$, so using Theorem 4.1 it makes sense to write

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a \epsilon^\star^\mu b)(u), v) &= \epsilon^{k+l} \sum_{r=0}^{k+l} (-1)^r (\mathcal{L}(B_r^\mu(a, b))(u), v) = \epsilon^{k+l} \sum_{r=0}^{k+l} (-1)^{k+l} (u, \mathcal{L}(B_r^\mu(a, b))(v)) \\ &= (-1)^{k+l} \sum_{r=0}^{k+l} \epsilon^r (u, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(B_r^\mu(a, b))(v)) = (-1)^{k+l} (u, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a \epsilon^\star^\mu b)(v)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by definition of $\epsilon^\star^\mu$ and Theorem 4.1,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a \epsilon^\star^\mu b)(u), v) &= (\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a) \circ \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(b)(u), v) = (-1)^k (\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(b)(u), \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a)(v)) \\ &= (-1)^{k+l} (u, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(b) \circ \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a)(v)) = (-1)^{k+l} (u, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(b \bar{\epsilon}^\star^{-\mu-n-1} a)(v)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the equality $(u, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a \epsilon^\star^\mu b)(v)) = (u, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(b \bar{\epsilon}^\star^{-\mu-n-1} a)(v))$ holds for all choices of u and v , which implies the claim. $\square$

In one dimension Proposition 4.2 specializes to equation 4.6 of [11].

Example 4.2. Let $a^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i[\lambda_1]$, $b^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i[\lambda_2]$, and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$. Write $\Lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$. Then

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{L}(a) \odot \mathcal{L}(b) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) = \frac{(\Lambda+n+2\mu+1)}{(\Lambda+n+3)} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_1(a, b)) + \frac{\mu(\Lambda+\mu+n+1)}{(\Lambda+n+2)_{(2)}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_0(a, b)).$$

In particular, if $\Lambda = 0$ and $\mu = -(n+1)/2$, then

$$\mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b) = \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(\{a, b\}) - \frac{(n+1)}{4(n+2)} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_0(a, b)).$$

This shows that

$$(4.20) \quad a \epsilon^\star^\mu b = a \odot b + \epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} \{a, b\} + \frac{n+1+2\mu}{n+3} \mathcal{L}_1(a, b) \right) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\mu(\mu+n+1)}{(n+2)(n+1)} \mathcal{L}_0(a, b),$$

$$(4.21) \quad a \bar{\epsilon}^\star b = a \odot b + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \{a, b\} - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} \right)^2 \frac{(n+1)}{(n+2)} \mathcal{L}_0(a, b).$$

To show (4.19) it suffices to verify the identities,

$$\hat{\nabla}_I \tilde{a}^{(I} \tilde{b}^{J)} = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_1(a, b)}^J + \frac{1}{\Lambda + n + 1} \widetilde{\mathcal{L}_0(a, b)} \mathbb{X}^J, \quad \widetilde{\langle a, b \rangle}^I = \{\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}\}^I,$$

and to use the definitions of the quantities involved.

Corollary 4.2. *The star product, $\epsilon^\star^\mu$, is **covariant** with respect to $\text{Diff}(M)$ in the sense that, for $a^i, b^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i$ there holds $a \epsilon^\star^\mu b - b \epsilon^\star^\mu a = \epsilon \{a, b\}$. That is, the restriction to vector fields of the star product commutator agrees with $\epsilon \{, \}$.*

Example 4.3. Let $a^{i_1 \dots i_k} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[0]$. Computing $\mathcal{L}(fa)(u)$ using (3.9) and (3.3) yields

$$(4.22) \quad f \epsilon^\star^\mu a = fa + \sum_{r \geq 1} \epsilon^r \frac{\binom{k}{s} \binom{\mu-k+s}{n+2k-s}}{\binom{n+2k-s}{s}} \mathcal{L}_{k-s}(a, f).$$

Using $\{a, f\} = k\mathcal{L}_{k-1}(a, f)$ in (4.22) yields (4.23), and using $a \epsilon^\star^\mu f = f - \epsilon^\star^{-\mu-n-1} a$ with (4.23) yields (4.24).

$$(4.23) \quad f \epsilon^\star^\mu a = fa + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\{f, a\} + \frac{k(n+1+2\mu)}{n+2k-1} \mathcal{L}_{k-1}(f, a) \right) + \sum_{s=2}^k \epsilon^s \frac{\binom{k}{s} \binom{\mu-k+s}{n+2k-s}}{\binom{n+2k-s}{s}} \mathcal{L}_{k-s}(a, f),$$

$$(4.24) \quad a \epsilon^\star^\mu f = fa + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\{a, f\} + \frac{k(n+1+2\mu)}{n+2k-1} \mathcal{L}_{k-1}(f, a) \right) + \sum_{s=2}^k \epsilon^s \frac{\binom{k}{s} \binom{n+k+\mu}{n+2k-s}}{\binom{n+2k-s}{s}} \mathcal{L}_{k-s}(a, f).$$

It follows that

$$(4.25) \quad \frac{1}{2}(a \epsilon^\star f - f \epsilon^\star a - \epsilon\{a, f\}) = \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} \epsilon^{2s+1} \frac{\binom{k}{2s+1} \binom{\frac{2k+n-1}{2}}{2s+1}}{\binom{n+2k-2s-1}{2s+1}} \mathcal{L}_{k-2s-1}(a, f).$$

In the special case that $a^{ij} \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(ij)}$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[0]$ there holds

$$(4.26) \quad a \epsilon^\star f = fa + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \{a, f\} + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)^2 \frac{(n+3)}{(n+2)} \mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = f - \epsilon^\star a.$$

The associativity of $\epsilon^\star$ and equations (4.21) and (4.26) imply that for $a^i, b^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[0]$ there hold the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(a, fb) - \mathcal{L}_0(b, fa) &= -\frac{n+2}{n+1} \{\{a, b\}, f\} \\ \mathcal{L}_0(a \odot b, f) &= \frac{(n+1)}{2(n+3)} (2\mathcal{L}_0(a, b)f - \mathcal{L}_0(a, fb) - \mathcal{L}_0(b, fa)) + \frac{(n+2)}{2(n+3)} (\{\{f, a\}, b\} + \{\{f, b\}, a\}). \end{aligned}$$

It would be interesting to understand these identities as special cases of some general family of identities.

Applying (4.24) in the one-dimensional case yields, for $u_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[2k]$ and $u_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[0]$,

$$(4.27) \quad u_1 \epsilon^\star^\mu u_2 = u_1 u_2 + \sum_{s=1}^k \epsilon^s \frac{(-1)^s \binom{k}{s} \binom{k+\mu+1}{s}}{\binom{2k}{s} \binom{2k+1-s}{s}} \mathcal{R}_s(u_1, u_2).$$

Let the notation be as in Section 3.1. In [11] an associative multiplication, $m^{(\mu)}(u_1, u_2)$, of $u_i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[2k_i]$, is defined by

$$(4.28) \quad m^{(\mu)}(u_1, u_2) = u_1 u_2 + \sum_{r \geq 1} t_r^\mu \mathcal{R}_r(u_1, u_2),$$

$$t_r^\mu = (-1/4)^r \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{\binom{r}{j} \binom{-1/2}{j} \binom{-3/2-\mu}{j} \binom{1/2+\mu}{j}}{\binom{k_1-1/2}{j} \binom{k_2-1/2}{j} \binom{r-k_1-k_2-3/2}{j}}.$$

The multiplications $m^{(\mu)}$ and $m^{(-2-\mu)}$ are the same, so that $m^{(\mu)}$ cannot be obtained from $\epsilon^\star^\mu$ merely by specializing the parameter ϵ . A multiplication such that $\epsilon \square^\mu = \epsilon \square^{-2-\mu}$ can be defined by $u_1 \epsilon \square^\mu u_2 = \frac{1}{2}(u_1 \epsilon^\star^\mu u_2 + u_1 \epsilon^\star^{-2-\mu} u_2)$. However, when $\mu \neq -1$, associativity is not clear. Using (4.27) it can be shown that in the special case $u_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[2k]$ and $u_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[0]$ that the coefficient of ϵ^2 in $u_1 \epsilon \square^\mu u_2$ equals $\frac{1}{4} t_2^\mu$, so $\epsilon \square^\mu$ has at least the right spirit. The remark at the very end of [14] that for $\mu = -1$ the one-dimensional projectively invariant star products correspond to the multiplications obtained in [11] is correct in the sense that, as just discussed, there must be an

explicit relation between $m^{(\mu)}$ and ${}_{\epsilon}\star^{\mu}$. However, the form of such a relation does not appear to follow immediately from the uniqueness of homogeneous invariant star products proved in [14], because even for $\mu = -1$ it is not apparent that the multiplications $m^{(\mu)}$ are star products. To pass from ${}_{\epsilon}\star^{\mu}$ to $m^{(\mu)}$ one has to perform manipulations involving specializing the parameter ϵ , and the result of these manipulations is hidden in the explicit formula for t_r^{μ} ; if t_r^{μ} is replaced by $\epsilon^r t_r^{\mu}$ in (4.28) it is not clear that the resulting multiplication should be associative.

4.4. Multiplication at Infinity.

Lemma 4.2. *For every $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ of B_r^{μ} is a polynomial in μ of degree at most r .*

Proof. Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$. It is claimed that $\mathcal{L}(a)(f)$ has the form $\sum_{s=0}^k C_s^{i_1 \dots i_s} \nabla_{i_1 \dots i_s} f$, where C_s is a universal polynomial in a and its covariant derivatives which is polynomial in μ of degree at most $k - s$. By definition $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}(a)}(f) = \tilde{a}^{I_1 \dots I_k} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_k} \tilde{f}$. For $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$, factors involving μ appear in this expression only through differentiation of $\tilde{f}$ in the vertical direction as in (3.3). From (3.3) it is clear that a polynomial of degree $k - s$ in μ appears only as the coefficient of a term involving s horizontal derivatives of $\tilde{f}$, and this shows the claim.

The proof of the lemma is by induction on r . The claim is true for $r = 1$ by (4.7). Let $a \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}_l$. By the inductive hypothesis, for $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$, $B_s^{\mu}(a, b)$ is a polynomial in μ of degree at most s . B_r^{μ} is defined by the requirement that $B_r^{\mu}(a, b)$ be the principal symbol of the operator $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b) - \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} \mathcal{L}(B_s^{\mu}(a, b))$, which has order at most $k + l - r$. By the inductive hypothesis and the remarks in the preceeding paragraph for $1 \leq s \leq r - 1$ the coefficient of the term in $\mathcal{L}(B_s^{\mu}(a, b))(f)$ involving $k + l - r$ derivatives of f is a polynomial in μ of degree at most $s + (r - s) = r$. Likewise, by the remarks in the preceeding paragraph the coefficient of the term in $\mathcal{L}(a) \circ \mathcal{L}(b)(f) - \mathcal{L}(a \odot b)(f)$ involving $k + l - r$ derivatives of f is a polynomial in μ of degree at most r . $B_r^{\mu}(a, b)$ must agree with the coefficient in $\mathcal{D}$ of $\nabla_{(i_1 \dots i_{k+l-r})} f$, which was just shown to be a polynomial in μ of degree at most r . This proves the lemma. $\square$

Proposition 4.3. *For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the limit of $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t \star^{c/t} = {}_{\infty}\star^c$ exists and is a commutative, graded differential star product having the form (1.3).*

Proof. Since the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k \times \mathcal{A}_l$ of B_r^{μ} is a polynomial in μ of degree at most r , for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}_l$, the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} a t \star^{c/t} b$ exists and differs from $a \odot b$ by a polynomial in c of order at most $k + l$. For each $c \in \mathbb{R}$ define $a {}_{\infty}\star^c b = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} a t \star^{c/t} b$. Taking limits in (4.18) shows that $a {}_{\infty}\star^c b = b {}_{\infty}\star^c a$, so that ${}_{\infty}\star^c$ defines a commutative, associative multiplication on $\mathcal{A}$. For $a \in \mathcal{A}_k$ and $b \in \mathcal{A}_l$, the product $a {}_{\infty}\star^c b$ differs from the usual multiplication by a polynomial of degree at most $k + l$ in c , the coefficient of c^s of which is a projectively invariant bilinear differential operator in a and b of degree at most $k + l - s$ in each argument. That ${}_{\infty}\star^c$ has the form (1.3) follows from (1.2). $\square$

The limiting definition of ${}_{\infty}\star^c$ was motivated by the multiplication $m^{(\infty)}$ defined in the one-dimensional case in section 4 of [11]. This is explained further in Example 4.5 below.

Example 4.4. For $a^i, b^i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i$, using (4.20) yields

$$a {}_{\infty}\star^c b = a \odot b + \frac{2c}{n+3} \mathcal{L}_1(a, b) + \frac{c^2}{(n+2)(n+1)} \mathcal{L}_0(a, b).$$

Comparing this example with (3.3) suggests Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $a_i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k_i})}$ and $f \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\mu]$. From (3.9) there follows

$$(4.29) \quad \tilde{a}_1^{(I_1 \dots I_{k_1})} \tilde{a}_2^{(I_{k_1+1} \dots I_K)} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_K} \tilde{f} = \mathcal{L}(a_1 \odot a_2)(f) + \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s} \binom{\mu+s-K}{s}}{\binom{n+2K-s}{s}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{K-s}(a_1, a_2))(f)$$

It is claimed that

$$\mathcal{L}(a_1) \circ \mathcal{L}(a_2)(f) - \tilde{a}_1^{(I_1 \dots I_{k_1})} \tilde{a}_2^{(I_{k_1+1} \dots I_K)} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_K} \tilde{f}$$

is a polynomial in μ of degree at most $K-1$. If there occurs in either $\mathcal{L}(a_1) \circ \mathcal{L}(a_2)(f)$ or $\tilde{a}_1^{(I_1 \dots I_{k_1})} \tilde{a}_2^{(I_{k_1+1} \dots I_K)} \hat{\nabla}_{I_1} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{I_K} \tilde{f}$ a term of order K in μ , this term must involve K vertical derivatives of $\tilde{f}$. With respect to any choice of projective scale the term in either expression involving K vertical derivatives of $\tilde{f}$ is $\tilde{a}_1^{(\infty \dots \infty)} \tilde{a}_2^{(\infty \dots \infty)} \hat{\nabla}_{\infty} \dots \hat{\nabla}_{\infty} \tilde{f}$, and this shows the claim. With (4.29) and (1.2) this claim shows that

$$(4.30) \quad \mathcal{L}(a_1) \circ \mathcal{L}(a_2)(f) - \mathcal{L}(a_1 \odot a_2)(f) - \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s} \binom{\mu+s-K}{s}}{\binom{n+2K-s}{s}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}_{K-s}(a_1, a_2))(f)$$

is a polynomial in μ of degree at most $K-1$ and a differential operator in f of degree at most $K-1$. Setting $\mu = \frac{c}{t}$ and multiplying (4.30) by t^K yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_t(a_1 t^{\star c/t} a_2) &= \mathcal{L}_t(a_1 \odot a_2) + \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s} \binom{c/t+s-K}{s}}{\binom{n+2K-s}{s}} t^s \mathcal{L}_t(\mathcal{L}_{K-s}(a_1, a_2)) + O(t) \mathcal{L}_t(b) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_t(a_1 \odot a_2) + \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s}}{(n+2K-s)_{(s)}} c^s \mathcal{L}_t(\mathcal{L}_{K-s}(a_1, a_2)) + O(t) \mathcal{L}_t(b') \end{aligned}$$

where b and b' have degree at most $K-1$. This implies

$$a_1 t^{\star c/t} a_2 = a_1 \odot a_2 + \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s}}{(n+2K-s)_{(s)}} c^s \mathcal{L}_{K-s}(a_1, a_2) + O(t)$$

and letting $t \rightarrow 0$ gives (1.4). With this definition the associativity of ${}_{\infty} \star^c$ is not entirely clear. Associativity follows immediately from the following alternative definition of ${}_{\infty} \star^c$, which shows that ${}_{\infty} \star^c$ is implicit already in (3.9).

The symmetric product of symmetric polyvectors on $\mathbf{L}$ having homogeneity 0 is again homogeneous of degree 0, so there is a graded subalgebra $\text{Pol}_0^b(T^*\mathbf{L}) \subset \text{Pol}^b(T^*\mathbf{L})$. There is a distinguished element, $\mathcal{X} \in \text{Pol}_0^b(T^*\mathbf{L})$ determined by $\mathbb{X}$ which in the notation of Section 3.2 can be written $\mathcal{X} = \hat{\Phi}(\mathbb{X})$. An element of $\text{Pol}_0^b(T^*\mathbf{L})$ is necessarily polynomial in $\mathcal{X}$. The algebra, $\mathcal{A}[c]$, of polynomials in c with coefficients in $\mathcal{A}$, is graded by the sum of the degree of the coefficients and the degree in c . The invariant lift of elements of $\mathcal{A}$ determined by the projective structure $[\nabla]$ determines a graded linear isomorphism $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{A}[c] \rightarrow \text{Pol}_0^b(T^*\mathbf{L})$ defined by letting $\mathcal{T}(ac^l) = \hat{\Phi}(\tilde{a}) \mathcal{X}^l$ for $a \in S^k(TM)$ and extending linearly. The map $\mathcal{T}$ is clearly injective. To see that it is surjective, let $A \in \text{Pol}_0^b(T^*\mathbf{L})$ be homogeneous of degree k in the fibers (i.e. correspond to a section of $S^k(T\mathbf{L})$); then $A = \sum_{m=0}^k \mathcal{T}(a_m) \mathcal{X}^m = \mathcal{T}(\sum_{m=0}^k a_m c^m)$ where the $a_i \in S^i(TM)$ are uniquely determined inductively by the requirement that for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ there hold $A - \sum_{m=k-i}^k \mathcal{T}(a_m) \mathcal{X}^{k-m} = 0 \pmod{\mathcal{X}^{i+1}}$. Define a multiplication, $\square$, on $\mathcal{A}[c]$ by setting $\mathcal{T}(a \square b) = \mathcal{T}(a) \mathcal{T}(b)$ for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and extending c -linearly. Together equation (3.9) and (1.4) show that $a \square b = a {}_{\infty} \star^c b$. Precisely, (3.9) yields $\hat{\Phi}(\tilde{a}_1) \hat{\Phi}(\tilde{a}_2) = \hat{\Phi}(a_1 \odot a_2) + \sum_{s=1}^K \frac{\binom{K}{s}}{(n+2K-s)_{(s)}} \hat{\Phi}(\mathcal{L}_{K-s}(a_1, a_2)) \mathcal{X}^s$, and the star product

$a_1 \square a_2 = a_1 \odot a_2 + \sum_{r \geq 1} B_r^\square(a_1, a_2) \mathcal{X}^r$ is defined by $\hat{\Phi}(\widetilde{a_1 \square a_2}) = \hat{\Phi}(\widetilde{a_1}) \hat{\Phi}(\widetilde{a_2})$ (where both $\hat{\Phi}$ and the invariant lift have been extended $\mathcal{X}$ -linearly). Equation (1.4) shows that $B_r^\square(a_1, a_2) = B_r^\infty(a_1, a_2)$, and so $\square = {}_\infty \star^c$. This shows that ${}_\infty \star^c$ is obtained by transporting the multiplication on $\text{Pol}_0^b(T^*\mathbb{L})$ to $\mathcal{A}$ via the invariant lift determined by $[\nabla]$. This construction makes evident the associativity of ${}_\infty \star^c$. $\square$

Example 4.5. Let the notation be as in Section 3.1. In [11] a commutative associative multiplication, $m^{(\infty)}(u_1, u_2)$, of $u_i \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}[2k_i]$, is defined by a limiting procedure and shown to have the form

$$m^{(\infty)}(u_1, u_2) = u_1 u_2 + \sum_{r \geq 1} t_{2r}^\infty \mathcal{R}_{2r}(u_1, u_2),$$

$$t_{2r}^\infty = \frac{(-1/2)_{(r)}}{(r - k_1 - 1/2)_{(r)}(r - k_2 - 1/2)_{(r)}(2r - k_1 - k_2 - 3/2)_{(r)}}.$$

Here it will be shown that for the special case $k_1 = k$, $k_2 = 0$, the product $m^{(\infty)}(u_1, u_2)$ is the real part of $u_1 {}_\infty \star^c u_2$ specialized at $c = 2i$. By (1.4) and the discussion in Section 3.1,

$$u_1 {}_\infty \star^c u_2 =$$

$$u_1 u_2 + \sum_{r \geq 1} \frac{\binom{k}{2r}}{(2k + 1 - 2r)_{(2r)} \binom{2k}{2r}} c^{2r} \mathcal{R}_{2r}(u_1, u_2) - \sum_{r \geq 0} \frac{\binom{k}{2r+1}}{(2k - 2r)_{(2r+1)} \binom{2k}{2r+1}} c^{2r+1} \mathcal{R}_{2r+1}(u_1, u_2).$$

It is easily checked that

$$\frac{\binom{k}{2r}}{(2k + 1 - 2r)_{(2r)} \binom{2k}{2r}} = (4^{2r} (r - k - 1/2)_{(r)} (2r - k - 3/2)_{(r)})^{-1} = (2i)^{-2r} t_{2r}^\infty,$$

and this proves that $\Re\{(u_1 {}_\infty \star^c u_2)|_{c=2i}\} = m^{(\infty)}(u_1, u_2)$.

4.5. Isomorphisms of Star Algebras. The pullback operator associated to $\phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ acts on $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ by graded Poisson automorphisms. By functoriality of the Thomas ambient connection the quantization maps associated to $[\nabla]$ and $[\bar{\nabla}] = \phi \cdot [\nabla]$ are related by conjugation, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_\epsilon(a) = \phi^* \circ \mathcal{L}_\epsilon((\phi^*)^{-1}(a)) \circ (\phi^*)^{-1}$. Using this a simple formal computation shows that $\phi^*(a {}_\epsilon \star b) = \phi^*(a) {}_\epsilon \bar{\star} \phi^*(b)$, so that the pullback operator gives a geometric isomorphism between the star products associated to $[\nabla]$ and $[\bar{\nabla}]$.

Lemma 4.3. *If $X \in \text{Vec}(M)$ is an infinitesimal automorphism of the projective structure, $[\nabla]$, on M , then $\mathfrak{L}_X$ is an inner derivation of the star algebra $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \{, \}, {}_\epsilon \star)$ associated to $[\nabla]$.*

Proof. By definition X is the infinitesimal generator of a one-parameter family, ϕ_t , of projective automorphisms of $[\nabla]$, for which $\phi_t^*(a {}_\epsilon \star b) = \phi_t^*(a) {}_\epsilon \star \phi_t^*(b)$. Differentiating this relation implies that $\mathfrak{L}_X(a {}_\epsilon \star b) = \mathfrak{L}_X(a) {}_\epsilon \star b + a {}_\epsilon \star \mathfrak{L}_X(b)$, showing that $\mathfrak{L}_X$ acts as a derivation. Likewise, differentiating $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a) = \phi_t^* \circ \mathcal{L}_\epsilon((\phi_t^{-1})^*(a)) \circ (\phi_t^{-1})^*$ shows the second equality of

$$\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(\{X, a\}) = \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{L}_X a) = [\mathfrak{L}_X, \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a)] = [\mathcal{L}_\epsilon(X), \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(a)] = \mathcal{L}_\epsilon(X {}_\epsilon \star a - a {}_\epsilon \star X).$$

This shows that $\epsilon\{X, a\} = \epsilon \mathfrak{L}_X a = X {}_\epsilon \star a - a {}_\epsilon \star X$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, which is the meaning of the statement that $\mathfrak{L}_X$ is inner. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *If two projective structures of dimension at least 2 determine the same star product, ${}_\epsilon \star$, then the projective structures are related by a projective automorphism.*

Proof. Let projective structures $[\bar{\nabla}]$ and $[\nabla]$ with difference tensor, $\Pi_{ij}{}^k$, determine the star products ${}_{\epsilon}\bar{\star}$ and ${}_{\epsilon}\star$. For $a^i, b^j \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^i$, computation using (3.6) and (4.21) shows

$$a {}_{\epsilon}\bar{\star} b - a {}_{\epsilon}\star b = -\frac{\epsilon^2(n+1)}{4(n+2)} \left(\frac{2}{1-n} (\nabla_p \Pi_{ij}{}^p + \frac{n+1}{2} \Pi_{ip}{}^q \Pi_{jq}{}^p) a^{(i} b^{j)} + \Pi_{ij}{}^k (a^j \nabla_k b^i + b^j \nabla_k a^i) \right).$$

Suppose that for all vector fields, a^i, b^j , there holds $a {}_{\epsilon}\bar{\star} b = a {}_{\epsilon}\star b$. Fix a point and at that point let the 1-jet of b be such that $b^i = 0$ and $\nabla_i b^j = c_i{}^j$. Then at that point $0 = a {}_{\epsilon}\bar{\star} b - a {}_{\epsilon}\star b = -\frac{\epsilon^2(n+1)}{4(n+2)} \Pi_{ij}{}^k a^j c_k{}^i$. Since this can be made true at every point for all choices of a^i and $c_i{}^j$, it shows that $\Pi_{ij}{}^k = 0$, so that the projective structures are the same. $\square$

Theorem 4.3. *The gauge-equivalence class of the star product ${}_{\epsilon}\star$ on $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ associated to the projective structure, $[\nabla]$, does not depend on the choice of projective structure.*

Proof. Given projective structures, $[\nabla]$ and $[\bar{\nabla}]$, define $D : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ by $D = \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\epsilon}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon}$ and extend D ϵ -linearly to $\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]]$. That $D(a {}_{\epsilon}\star b) = D(a) {}_{\epsilon}\bar{\star} D(b)$ is immediate. For $a \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_k)}$, since the principal symbol of each of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\epsilon}(a)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon}(a)$ is $\epsilon^k a$, there holds $D(a) = a + O(\epsilon)$. Let $D_1(a) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k-1})}$ be the principal symbol of $\epsilon^{-k}(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\epsilon}(a) - \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon}(a))$, which is a differential operator in a of order at most $k-1$. Thus $D(a) = a + \epsilon D_1(a) + O(\epsilon)$. Continuing inductively, one finds $D(a) = \sum_{r=1}^k \epsilon^r D_r(a)$ where $D_r(a) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(i_1 \dots i_{k-r})}$. In general $D = \sum_{r \geq 0} \epsilon^r D_r$ and D is graded differential in the sense that the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k$ of D_r is a linear differential operator of order at most $k-r$. $\square$

By a Poisson algebra automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ is meant a bijective, $\mathbb{R}$ -linear map which is simultaneously an automorphism of the underlying associative algebra structure of $\mathcal{A}$ and of the Lie algebra structure given by $\{, \}$. The action of the differential of $\phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ induces an automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ to be denoted ϕ^* . Each closed one-form, α , on M , induces an automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ as follows. The one-form α determines a $C^\infty(M)$ -module map $\mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ by $A \rightarrow \alpha(A)$, and this map may be extended to be identically 0 on $\mathcal{A}_0$. Because $\alpha : \mathcal{A}_0 \oplus \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ is an $\mathcal{A}_0$ -module map, it extends uniquely to an associative algebra derivation $\alpha : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. Namely, for $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}_1$, define $\alpha(A_1 \odot \dots \odot A_k) = \sum_{s=1}^k \alpha(A_s) A_1 \odot \dots \odot \hat{A}_s \odot \dots \odot A_k$ and extend $\mathbb{R}$ -linearly to all of $\mathcal{A}$. Because α is closed there holds $\alpha(\{A, B\}) = \{\alpha(A), B\} + \{A, \alpha(B)\}$ for $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_1$, and so α extends to a Poisson algebra derivation on all of $\mathcal{A}$, which is graded nilpotent in the sense that the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_k$ of this derivation is nilpotent of order $k+1$. As the restriction to any $\mathcal{A}_k$ is a finite sum, it makes sense to define $\exp(\alpha) = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{r \geq 1} \frac{\alpha^r}{r!}$, where α^r denotes r -fold composition.

Proposition 4.5 ([21]). *A Poisson algebra automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ has the form $\phi^* \circ \exp(\alpha)$ for some $\phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ and some closed one-form, α , on M .*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 6 of [21], though the terminology of Poisson automorphism is used here slightly differently than in that paper. For convenience, the proof is given here in a condensed form. Let Φ be an automorphism of the Poisson algebra, $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$. First it is claimed that Φ is necessarily filtration preserving in the sense that $\Phi(\mathcal{A}^i) \subset \mathcal{A}^i$. Because $\{\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_j\} \subset \mathcal{A}_{i+j-1}$, elements of $\mathcal{A}_0$ are lowering in the sense that taking the Poisson bracket with an element of $\mathcal{A}_0$ lowers the degree. In fact, $\mathcal{A}_0$ is characterized as the set of $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for any $B \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a $k \geq 1$ so that the k -fold iterated Poisson bracket $\{A, \{A, \dots \{A, B\} \dots\}$ vanishes. This subset is evidently preserved by the action of Φ , and so $\Phi(\mathcal{A}_0) \subset \mathcal{A}_0$. In general, $\mathcal{A}^{i+1}$ comprises those $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for every $B \in \mathcal{A}_0$ there holds $\{A, B\} \in \mathcal{A}^i$, and from this the claim follows by induction. Precisely, assume $\Phi(\mathcal{A}^i) \subset \mathcal{A}^i$. Then for $A \in \mathcal{A}^{i+1}$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $\{\Phi(A), \Phi(B)\} = \Phi(\{A, B\})$ and as $\{A, B\} \in \mathcal{A}^i$ the inductive hypothesis, implies $\Phi(\{A, B\}) \in \mathcal{A}^i$. Since the restriction to $\mathcal{A}_0$ of Φ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{A}_0$, this shows that $\Phi(A) \in \mathcal{A}^{i+1}$. By the preceding $\Phi(\mathcal{A}_0) \subset \mathcal{A}_0$ and

$\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_0) \subset \mathcal{A}_0$ so $\Phi|_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ is an automorphism of the associative algebra $\mathcal{A}_0 = C^\infty(M)$. Every such automorphism has the form $f \rightarrow f \circ \phi^{-1}$ for some $\phi \in \text{Diff}(M)$ (see e.g. [25]). The composition $\phi^* \circ \Phi$ restricts to the identity on $\mathcal{A}_0$, so it may be assumed that $\Phi|_{\mathcal{A}_0} = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{A}_0}$. It will be shown that $\Phi = \exp(\alpha)$ for some closed one-form, α .

If $\Phi|_{\mathcal{A}_0} = \text{Id}_{\mathcal{A}_0}$ then $\Phi(fA) = \Phi(f)\Phi(A) = f\Phi(A)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$, so that Φ is an $\mathcal{A}_0$ -module homomorphism. For $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $\Phi(A) = \Phi_1(A) + \Phi_0(A)$ with $\Phi_i(A) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, and so $\mathfrak{L}_A f = \Phi(\mathfrak{L}_A f) = \Phi(\{A, f\}) = \{\Phi(A), \Phi(f)\} = \{\Phi_1(A), f\} = \mathfrak{L}_{\Phi_1(A)} f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}_1 = \text{Vec}(M)$. This implies that $\Phi_1(A) = A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$. For $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_1$, expanding $\{\Phi(A), \Phi(B)\} = \Phi(\{A, B\})$ yields $\Phi_0(\{A, B\}) = \{A, \Phi_0(B)\} - \{B, \Phi_0(A)\}$. It follows that $\Phi_0 : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0$ is an $\mathcal{A}_0$ -module homomorphism and a 1-cocycle in the Lie algebra cohomology of $\text{Vec}(M) = \mathcal{A}_1$ with coefficients in $C^\infty(M) = \mathcal{A}_0$. Every cocycle of $\text{Vec}(M)$ with coefficients in $C^\infty(M)$ has the form $c\text{div} + \alpha$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and some closed one-form α on M , where div denotes any choice of divergence operator (any two divergence operators determine cohomologous cocycles). Evidently such a cocycle is a $C^\infty(M)$ -module homomorphism if and only if $c = 0$. It follows that $\Phi_0(A) = \alpha(A)$ for some closed 1-form α . Since $\mathcal{A}^1$ generates $\mathcal{A}$ as a $\mathcal{A}_0$ -module, two $\mathcal{A}_0$ -module homomorphisms of $\mathcal{A}$ which agree on $\mathcal{A}^1$ must be identical, and so $\Phi = \exp(\alpha)$. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *A Poisson algebra automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ extends to an automorphism of the star algebra $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \epsilon\star)$ if and only if it is induced by the action of some element of $\text{Diff}(M)$.*

Proof. Any $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ acts as an automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \epsilon\star)$ to first order in the sense that $\Phi(a \epsilon\star b) = \Phi(a) \epsilon\star \Phi(b) + O(\epsilon^2)$, so to prove the claim it is necessary to examine terms of second order. By Proposition 4.5 it suffices to show that if $\Phi = \exp(\alpha)$ acts as an automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \epsilon\star)$, then $\alpha = 0$. Let $a^{ij} \in \mathcal{E}^{ij}$ and $f \in \mathcal{E}[0]$. By (4.26) and because $\exp(\alpha)$ acts as the identity on functions on M and as a Poisson algebra automorphism, $\exp(\alpha)(a \epsilon\star f) = \exp(\alpha)(a) \epsilon\star \exp(\alpha)(f)$ if and only if

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_0(\exp(\alpha)(a), f) - \mathcal{L}_0(a, f) = \alpha_j a^{ij} \nabla_i f$$

holds for all a^{ij} and all f . This implies $\alpha = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *If $T = \sum_{r \geq 0} \epsilon^r T_r$ is a star algebra isomorphism of $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \epsilon\star)$, then $T_0 : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a Poisson algebra automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$.*

Proof. For $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, expanding $T(a \epsilon\star b) = T(a) \epsilon\bar{\star} T(b)$ by ϵ -linearity gives

$$T(a \odot b) + \epsilon T(\{a, b\}) = T(a) \odot T(b) + \epsilon \{T(a), T(b)\} + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Projecting mod ϵ this implies $T_0(a \odot b) = T_0(a) \odot T_0(b)$, and then projecting mod ϵ^2 implies that $T_0(\{a, b\}) = \{T_0(a), T_0(b)\}$, so that $T_0 : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a Poisson algebra homomorphism. By assumption T has an inverse, $T^{-1} = \sum_{r \geq 0} \epsilon^r S_r$. Expanding by ϵ -linearity gives $a = S_0(T_0(a)) + O(\epsilon)$, which implies $S_0(T_0(a)) = a$, so that T_0 has an inverse which is a Poisson algebra homomorphism, and this proves the claim. $\square$

In particular Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 imply that a geometric isomorphism of $(\mathcal{A}[[\epsilon]], \epsilon\star)$ is induced by extending ϵ -linearly a Poisson algebra automorphism of $(\mathcal{A}, \{, \})$ and also that this Poisson algebra automorphism must be induced by a diffeomorphism of M . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

REFERENCES

1. S. Alexakis, *On conformally invariant differential operators in odd dimensions*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **100** (2003), no. 8, 4409–4410 (electronic).

2. A. Astashkevich and R. Brylinski, *Non-local equivariant star product on the minimal nilpotent orbit*, Adv. Math. **171** (2002), no. 1, 86–102.
3. T. N. Bailey, M. G. Eastwood, and A. R. Gover, *Thomas’s structure bundle for conformal, projective and related structures*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **24** (1994), no. 4, 1191–1217.
4. T. N. Bailey, M. G. Eastwood, and C. R. Graham, *Invariant theory for conformal and CR geometry*, Ann. of Math. (2) **139** (1994), no. 3, 491–552.
5. M. Bordemann, *Sur l’existence d’une prescription d’ordre naturelle projectivement invariante*, available at [arXiv:math.DG/0208171](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0208171).
6. S. Bouarroudj, *Projectively equivariant quantization map*, Lett. Math. Phys. **51** (2000), no. 4, 265–274.
7. ———, *Formula for the projectively invariant quantization on degree three*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **333** (2001), no. 4, 343–346.
8. R. Brylinski, *Nonlocality of equivariant star products on $T^*(\mathbb{R}P^n)$* , Lett. Math. Phys. **58** (2001), no. 1, 21–28.
9. D. M. J. Calderbank and T. Diemer, *Differential invariants and curved Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand sequences*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **537** (2001), 67–103.
10. H. Cohen, *Sums involving the values at negative integers of L-functions of quadratic characters*, Math. Ann. **217** (1975), 271–285.
11. P. B. Cohen, Y. Manin, and D. Zagier, *Automorphic pseudodifferential operators*, Algebraic aspects of integrable systems, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., vol. 26, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1997, pp. 17–47.
12. A. Connes and H. Moscovici, *Modular Hecke algebras and their Hopf symmetry*, Mosc. Math. J. **4** (2004), no. 1, 67–109, 310.
13. ———, *Rankin-Cohen brackets and the Hopf algebra of transverse geometry*, Mosc. Math. J. **4** (2004), no. 1, 111–130, 311.
14. C. Duval, A. M. El Gradechi, and V. Ovsienko, *Projectively and conformally invariant star-products*, Comm. Math. Phys. **244** (2004), no. 1, 3–27.
15. C. Duval, P. B. A. Lecomte, and V. Ovsienko, *Methods of equivariant quantization*, Noncommutative differential geometry and its applications to physics (Shonan, 1999), Math. Phys. Stud., vol. 23, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2001, pp. 1–12.
16. M. G. Eastwood, *Higher symmetries of the laplacian*, Ann. Math. **161** (2005), no. 3, 1645–1665.
17. M. G. Eastwood and C. R. Graham, *Invariants of conformal densities*, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), no. 3, 633–671.
18. C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham, *Q-curvature and Poincaré metrics*, Math. Res. Lett. **9** (2002), no. 2-3, 139–151.
19. C. Fefferman and K. Hirachi, *Ambient metric construction of Q-curvature in conformal and CR geometries*, Math. Res. Lett. **10** (2003), no. 5-6, 819–831.
20. A. R. Gover, *Invariants and calculus for projective geometries*, Math. Ann. **306** (1996), no. 3, 513–538.
21. J. Grabowski and N. Poncin, *Automorphisms of quantum and classical Poisson algebras*, Compos. Math. **140** (2004), no. 2, 511–527.
22. S. Gutt, *Variations on deformation quantization*, Conférence Moshé Flato 1999, Vol. I (Dijon), Math. Phys. Stud., vol. 21, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000, pp. 217–254.
23. R. Jenne, *A construction of conformally invariant differential operators*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Washington, 1988.
24. P. B. A. Lecomte and V. Yu. Ovsienko, *Projectively equivariant symbol calculus*, Lett. Math. Phys. **49** (1999), no. 3, 173–196.
25. J. Mrcun, *On isomorphisms of algebras of smooth functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2005), 3109–3113.
26. R. A. Rankin, *The construction of automorphic forms from the derivatives of a given form*, J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.) **20** (1956), 103–116.
27. D. Sternheimer, *Deformation quantization: twenty years after*, Particles, fields, and gravitation (Łódź, 1998), AIP Conf. Proc., vol. 453, Amer. Inst. Phys., Woodbury, NY, 1998, pp. 107–145.
28. T. Y. Thomas, *Conformal tensors. (First note)*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **18** (1932), no. 1, 103–112.
29. ———, *The differential invariants of generalized spaces*, Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, 1934.
30. H. Weyl, *Zur Infinitesimalgeometrie: Einordnung der projektiven und konformen Auffassung*, Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse (1921), 99–112.
31. D. Zagier, *Modular forms and differential operators*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. **104** (1994), no. 1, 57–75, K. G. Ramanathan memorial issue.

E-mail address: fox@math.gatech.edu